NOV 10 1948

The American Political Science Review

BOARD OF EDITORS

Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford University
Robert E. Cushman, Cornell University
David Fellman, University of Wisconsin
Robert K. Gooch, University of Virginia
Charles B. Hagan, University of Illinois
Robert J. Harris, Louisiana State University
Fritz Morstein Marx, U. S. Bureau of the Budget
Louise Overacker, Wellesley College
C. Herman Pritchett, University of Chicago
Harold S. Quigley, University of Minnesota
Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor, University of Wisconsin

VOL. XLII OCTOBER, 1948 NO. 5

PERIODICAL ROOM GENERAL LIBRARY UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

Reflections on Agricultural Policy Formation in the United States	Charles M. Hardin	881
Absolutism and Relativism in Philosophy and Politics	Hans Kelsen	906
Public Administration		
The Application of Scientific Management Principles to International Administration	Donald C. Stone	915
Post-war Politics in Japan: A Symposium, I	Harold S. Quigley (ed.)	927
I. The Japanese Diet Under the New Constitution	Justin Williams	927
II. Pre-war Political Influences in Post-war Conservative Parties	Kenneth E. Colton	940
III. Japan's Post-war Socialist Party	John Saffell	957
News and Notes, Personal and Miscellaneous	Managing Editor	970
Book Reviews and Notices		984
Recent Publications of Political Interest: Books and Periodicals	Charles B. Hagan and J. Austin Ranney	1043
Government Publications	Miles O. Price	1070
Notes on Some Recent Documentary Materials	James B. Childs	1076

(For list of Book Reviews, see next page)

Published Bimonthly by
THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Editorial Office
209 South Hall
University of Wisconsin
Madison 6, Wisconsin

Secretary of the Association
100 University Hall
Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Foreign Agents, P. S. King and Staples, Ltd., Great Smith St., Westminster, London

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wis., under the Act of August 4, 1912.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 12, 1926.

Made in the United States of America

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Lauterbach, Economic Security and Individual Freedom. Avery Leiserson 984
Rosenfarb, Freedom and the Administrative State. James L. McCamy 985
Gosnell, Democracy—The Threshold of Freedom. E. Allen Helms. 987
Warner, The Principles of Public Administration. Norman Wengert 988
Doob, Public Opinion and Propaganda. Harwood L. Childs 989
Kerwin (ed.), Civil-Military Relationships in American Life. Thomas S. Barclay 992
Griswold, Farming and Democracy. Charles M. Hardin 993
The Memoirs of Cordell Hull. Clarence A. Berdahl 995
MacIver, The More Perfect Union. Carl Brent Swisher 998
Gerald, The Press and the Constitution. William O. Farber 999
1946 Annual Survey of American Law. C. Perry Patterson 1001
Petrullo, Puerto Rican Paradox. Dunbar Rowland 1003
Simkins, The South Old and New. Jasper B. Shannon 1004
Rossiter, Constitutional Dictatorship. Karl Loewenstein 1006
Price and Schorske, The Problem of Germany; *Barth*, The Only Way; How Can Germany Be Cured? Henry P. Jordan 1009
Ebon, World Communism Today. Ossip K. Flechtheim 1013
Warren, The English Local Government System. Charkes Aikin . 1014
Jessup, The Modern Law of Nations. Lawrence Preuss 1015
Bailey, The Man in the Street. Grayson L. Kirk 1018
Furnivall, Colonial Policy and Practice. Lennox A. Mills 1019
Briefer Notices 1021

Rodgers and Rankin, New York: The World's Capital City; *Bean*, How to Predict Elections; *Smith*, A President Is Many Men; *Hesseltine*, The Rise and Fall of Third Parties; *Wecter*, The Age of the Great Depression; *Buck and Masland*, The Governments of Foreign Powers; *Robinson*, The British Post Office; *Fitzgibbon*, The Constitutions of the Americas; *Clyde*, The Far East; *Brown*, Lawyers, Law Schools, and Public Service; etc.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, published bimonthly, is supplied to all members of the American Political Science Association. The annual dues are $6.60 a year ($3.60 for graduate and undergraduate students). $1.00 should be added for foreign postage.

Current issues, $1.25 per copy. Prices of other issues, and of complete volumes, are listed near the end of this number.

Applications for membership, orders for the REVIEW, and remittances should be addressed to Harvey Walker, 100 University Hall, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.

Correspondence concerning contributions to the REVIEW—also books submitted for review—should be addressed to Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor, 209 South Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin.

Articles and notes in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*.

Copyright, 1948, by the American Political Science Association.

The American
Political Science Review

VOL. XLII OCTOBER, 1948 NO. 5

REFLECTIONS ON AGRICULTURAL POLICY FORMATION IN THE UNITED STATES

CHARLES M. HARDIN
University of Chicago

I. THE IMMEDIATE SETTING

Major redefinition of agricultural policy in the United States appears imminent. Appropriate committees in both houses of Congress held exhaustive hearings during 1947 on both the content of agricultural policy (revision of parity, manner of price supports, regulation of marketing, and production control) and the manner of organization of agricultural administration. In its last hours, the Eightieth Congress revised parity and price supports, postponing the effective date to January 1, 1950. But, significantly, Congress could not agree on a reorganization of agricultural administration. There was no lack of proposals. Major farm organizations and the Department of Agriculture presented recommendations, and sweeping measures were introduced by Senator Aiken (and others) and Congressman Hope. But the Hope and Aiken bills were diametrically opposed in a manner reflecting basic divergencies among powerful interests. In part, of course, the failure of the Eightieth Congress to reorganize the administrative framework appears to mark the strategic success of Congressman Hope's efforts to insure the next secretary of agriculture some freedom in the matter. But the failure certainly underlines the controversial nature of the subject; indeed, the manner of administration in agriculture is hardly less controversial than the content of agricultural policy.[1]

II. THE DEBATE FAILS TO PROBE CERTAIN CRUCIAL ISSUES

Not only are issues respecting administrative organization in agriculture controversial, but the controversy is presented in dis-

[1] For more elaboration, see Nov., 1948, issue of *Journal of Farm Economics.*

torted and inadequate terms. It is well known that agriculture is highly organized.[2] Nearly all recommendations respecting agricultural policy are made by institutional spokesmen—that is, by persons representative of particular associations in the sense that these persons are the caretakers, expositors, and sometimes even the personification[3] of associational codes.[4] No doubt, association with, say, the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the Farm Bureau, or a land-grant college greatly helps an individual to relate his activities in a meaningful way to the larger society. At any rate, associations constitute a large part of the phenomena of social life and force consideration of themselves as well in matters of public policy formation as in its execution. The farm organizations, the land-grant colleges, the USDA and various agencies within it—all make their recommendations very strongly respecting administrative policy; and this is true whether Congress holds hearings in Washington or attempts directly to tap "grass roots" sentiment.[5]

The recommendations of interested parties do less than justice to the issues. For example, one of the chief bones of contention is the SCS program. Should the federal government operate an intensive program of farm planning to improve soil and moisture conservation direct with farmers, organized in soil conservation districts? Land-grant college representatives and the AFBF generally argue that the chief problem of "federal-state relations" in agriculture would disappear if the SCS regional offices were abolished and the program assigned at the state level to agricultural extension services where it would become another project. In this representation, the issue is often posed as "duplication and overlapping;" yet largely overlooked is the question whether erosion is not a symptom of basic maladjustments in farm sizes, of fundamental inadequacies in tenure arrangements, and in significant failure of credit

[2] Reference is to the National Farmers Union, the Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), the land-grant colleges, the Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), the Production and Marketing Administration (PMA), which embraces the old Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA), etc.

[3] Cf. R. Smend on personal integration in *Verfassung und Verfassungslehre*, but also H. Kelsen, *Der Staat als Integration*.

[4] See Chester Barnard, *The Functions of the Executive*, which, with T. Parsons, *Structure of Social Action*, Herbert Simon, *Administrative Behavior*, and W. Y. Elliott, *The Pragmatic Revolt in Politics*, have considerably influenced the thought in this paper.

[5] *E.g.*, *Hearings* before the House Committee on Agriculture, Long Range Agricultural Policy, 1947.

agencies to provide credit for farm enlargement and improvement, integrated with farm readjustment planning.[6] SCS and its friends counter with proposals which, in their most significant recent form, would not only considerably extend and expand the SCS program itself but also would erect soil and water conservation into the paramount end of agricultural policy.[7] But agricultural policy has other ends, such as the stabilization of incomes, rural rehabilitation (or, more significantly, the improvement of farm family living), and shifts in production according to nutritional needs.

Thus the argument is distorted in the effort to force the issues to conform with the aspirations of particular groups and organizations. Likewise, the argument is grievously inadequate because the possibility of *political decentralization* or devolution is overlooked. G. C. S. Benson reminds us of the difference between administrative and political decentralization, the former being a question of management policy.[8] Paul Appleby remarks: "Nothing can be decentralized properly which has not first been centralized. The basic essential is national controllability."[9] In both concepts, administrative decentralization is on the terms of some national agency, responsible to President and Congress.

Yet in agriculture control over much research and educational work (extension) has never effectively been centralized, a situation supported by cogent reasons.[10] Much of this work has been vested

[6] "In so far as the educational and demonstrational soil conservation program is concerned, we recommend that it be conducted in the states as a special project in Extension Work." Statement, Representatives of Ass'n of Land Grant Colleges . . . House Committee on Agriculture, Jan. 13, 1948, mimeo., p. 35. It is true that the discussion of "duplication and overlapping" is pointed up by an analysis of the need for consideration of the whole farm (e.g., pp. 32–33); yet soil erosion as a symptom is glossed over. It is also true that the Committee on Agricultural Policy of the Land Grant College Association has presented numerous and penetrating analysis on this and related subjects, the most recent of which appears in Part 15, Long-Range Agricultural Policy, *Hearings*, House Committee on Agriculture, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. Yet here also, recommendations which find their way into proposed legislation, such as the Aiken bill (S. 2318, 80th Congress), are primarily concerned with giving SCS its come-uppance. Regarding "duplication and overlapping," some trenchant testimony has been introduced, e.g., H. C. Sanders, before the House Committee on Agriculture, Mar. 3, 1948 (mimeo.). Yet I suggest that concern with duplication can easily obscure more fundamental issues as to what is involved in agricultural policy.

[7] The Hope bill. H.R. 6054, 80th Cong.

[8] *The New Centralization*, p. 9. [9] *Big Democracy*, p. 104.

[10] For research, see Charles M. Hardin, "Programmatic Research and Agricultural Policy," *Journal of Farm Economics*, May, 1947. An article is being prepared upon the function of extension in this respect; see also a forthcoming book by C. M. Hardin and Norman Wengert.

in the land-grant colleges; and a pertinent question arises: To whom are the colleges responsible? Moreover, in certain administrative programs, such as the Agricultural Conservation Program of PMA (formerly the AAA), a superficial appearance of centralization and subsequent decentralization, subject to the organizing control of the USDA, veils significant developments. Thus real control over personnel and policies of this program tends to slip away from the Secretary of Agriculture and to become vested in chairmen (and others) of state PMA committees, who appear to be in a sufficiently strong position independently to modify departmental control.[11] Again the question is pertinent: To whom are the state and local PMA committees responsible?

The upshot of these questions as to controllability suggests that the argument is distorted by over-emphasis upon the interests of various groups concerned. To put the matter baldly, the search for formulae to accommodate several associational interests obscures significant questions: To whom are administrators responsible? And for what are they responsible? It is quite conceivable that we will emerge with an agricultural field organization built upon a network of state and local farmer-elected committees which effectively interlock with influential persons in state and local farm organizations. Such organization would be responsible neither to the Secretary of Agriculture nor to any effective general electorate. It might mark a radical step in the already pronounced trend away from responsible government in agriculture. The effect upon rural public opinion may be profound. By this I mean that the network of state, county, and community committeemen constitutes an information service with great possibilities of indoctrination with respect to farmers' attitudes and opinions.[12] More than this, the committee structure presents the obvious channel (perhaps will come to be the only effective channel) through which modifications of agricultural policy might be effectuated—yet, in so far

[11] The controversy aroused by Secretary Anderson's reorganization order in Sept.–Oct., 1946, is illustrative of the strength and independence of state PMA chairmen. See the *National Union Farmer*, Nov. 1, 1946, AFBF *Official News Letter*, Oct. 16, 1946, Secretary Anderson's address to the National Grange (Portland, Oregon, Nov. 15, 1946, mimeo.), and compare the proposals of Secretary Anderson before a joint meeting of a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture, *Hearings* on the Long-Range Farm Program, Washington, Oct. 6–8, 1947.

[12] The stereotypes reflecting the orthodox AAA program in the field hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1947 are notable.

as this administrative organization evolves a code, a set of institutional "law-norms" in Sorokin's parlance,[13] it will be doubtful whether any basic changes in agricultural policy that conflict with the accepted ideology can emerge.[14]

To say that the present debate over organization of public administration in agriculture is distorted and incomplete implies that some other theoretical concept is possible, some generalizing concept which is ill-served by recommendations based upon rationalizations of associational interests, and which is to be contrasted in its completeness with the partiality that characterizes the representations of pressure groups. I can discuss this implication under "Political Decentralization."

III. POLITICAL DECENTRALIZATION—IS IT POSSIBLE?

John D. Black has analyzed Jasper and Douglas counties, Illinois,[15] the former with relatively poor soils, the latter with relatively good soils (analyses indicate Douglas soils to be approximately twice as rich in organic matter, nitrogen, phosphoric acid, potash, calcium, and magnesium as Jasper soils). The difference in soils was matched (according to the 1939 census) by differences in the farms. Thus Jasper farms averaged 120 acres to Douglas's 184; Jasper had an average of $4,440 in land, buildings, and machinery as against Douglas's $25,610; Jasper had an average of $965 from farm products sold, traded, or used at home as against Douglas's $3,530. Such were typical differences between two counties relatively close together geographically. Black's analysis calls for a system of land-use suited to the soils of Jasper county, involving enlargement of farms, shifts in farm enterprises, and better adaptations of relevant farm technology.

Clearly, with all that can be said for the national agricultural

[13] *Society, Culture, and Personality.*

[14] I am mindful of the remarkable changes in the parity formula which, e.g., the AFBF has sponsored, and also of the relative independence of corn-belt farmers in their current prosperity (see W. G. Murray's remarks as reported in the *N. Y. Times*, Sunday, July 4, 1948, Sec. 2); but I am also mindful of the statement of Edward A. O'Neal: "As a matter of fact, we in the Farm Bureau would feel better about the situation if there were less talk about new approaches and new programs." *Nation's Agriculture*, Nov., 1947.

[15] "Notes on 'Poor Land' and 'Submarginal Land,' " *Journal of Farm Economics*, May, 1945. Jasper county is illustrative only. Black remarks: "The Jasper county situation is only one among many hundreds in the country, each with its own particular complexion." Cf. pp. 370ff.

programs, what is needed in Jasper county is a program radically adapted to the local peculiarities. Suppose that all the technical information were available and had been tried on pilot farms to prove the economic feasibility of farms differently organized and, say, double the size of present Jasper county farms. The problem of how to shift from present farm organization to that proposed would still remain. In large part, the problem is political. That is, its "solution" poses choices among different policies to be locally applied; moreover, it requires canvassing all possible contingencies and developing a local program accordingly.

The political aspects appear clearly when one recognizes that the choices would involve conflict. Suppose the county were empowered to zone agricultural land for different uses (exempted under the Illinois county zoning act of 1935). This might enable an important step to be taken in the long-run adjustment of agriculture in Jasper. But county zoning would require not only comprehensive analysis, but also conscious choice on the part of the county board. Suppose further that a land utilization project were set up, as was done frequently under federal authority in the 1930's. Nothing prevents a county from being authorized to purchase land, develop it, and then re-sell it or lease it for grazing privileges. But again the initial decision to do so and the subsequent administration, particularly with respect to who would get grazing permits, would involve local political choice. In addition, a radical readjustment of agriculture in Jasper county would require coördination with the county and township road system, school administration, and the levying and assessment of taxes. All these matters involve political choices.[16]

[16] Cf. Clyde F. Snider, *County Government in Illinois* (1943). Jasper county has a board of supervisors elected by townships, which, among other things, levies taxes and makes appropriations; assessment is performed by township assessors, supervised by the county treasurer; but the county is subject to the over-all constitutional limit of 75 cents per $100 of assessed valuation, unless a higher rate is approved by referendum; a lower limit is imposed by legislation, subject to increase by referendum; counties operate under numerous restrictions upon borrowing and a general debt limit of five per cent of the total assessed valuation of the county. Illinois counties have the characteristic elective "row offices," under the constitution of 1870, which is practically unamendable. Counties range greatly in resources; thus with some 75 per cent of Douglas's population (1940), Jasper had only one-third as much assessed valuation (1941). Cf. Snider, p. 32. This material is introduced to indicate the writer's awareness of the county as "the dark continent," as a "patchwork of boards," etc. Yet, the more one contemplates positive agricultural policy, including quotas, price supports, payments, technical assistance, farm and area planning, REA development, etc., the more it seems clear that some local unit of

Query: Could not federal legislation be enacted to empower the USDA to "make an offer" to Jasper county, for example, and to the state of Illinois? This offer might enable Jasper county to administer the agricultural conservation payment program, and might include considerable authority over the use of public credit for agriculture in the county.[17] The grant would be limited. Thus only a certain amount of money would be available for conservation payments; and, to be consistent with national policy, the county might be required to stay within a certain acreage of corn or perhaps of "total soil depleting crops." Moreover, the county might be required to follow a process of administration which would demand that local adjustment and credit policy *follow after* analyses by competent technicians, although if local self-determination is to mean anything, local policy should not be required to be *based upon* the recommendations of such analyses. The offer might be contingent upon Illinois' adaptation of statutes enabling county reorganization and the consequent reorganization of Jasper county to vest greater responsibility in the board of supervisors over the levying and assessment of taxes, road administration, the zoning of agricultural land, etc. An effective merit system for county personnel might be required. Screams about federal domination by self-

---

general government should be in position to make local adaptations of agricultural policy, some of which must be political. *General* governmental units are advocated as against special districts, e.g., soil conservation districts with ordinance-making powers, because it is to be hoped that a local political function might develop which is forced to assume the politician's difficult task of appraising numerous policies, e.g., for schools, roads, and welfare, as well as for agriculture and conservation *per se*. Thus numerous ends would have to be weighed against each other, and the institutional situation would be created which encourages politicians to accept that "responsibility to the consequences" stressed by Max Weber in "Politics as Vocation." I am much impressed by E. W. Weidner, "A Review of the Controversy over County Executives," *Public Administration Review*, Winter, 1948, who writes: "There are those who are skeptical of the chances of council-manager government to improve county government because of the strength of political parties in the counties. They believe that the council-manager plan would bring a change in form only and not in substance—that the managership would be given to the county boss. In response, it may be said that if parties do not reform, at least everyone will know who is responsible for poor government—that in any event the change will not result in worsened conditions. On the other hand, there is nothing in the manager plan that makes it undesirable to have the county controlled by the dominant political party of the area if that party has a sense of public responsibility" (p. 27).

[17] On credit, see the interesting suggestion for county assumption of discretion and responsibility in John D. Black, "Agricultural Credit Policy in the U. S., 1945," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Aug., 1945, at pp. 612–13.

appointed states'-righters are anticipated, but note that the upshot of federal requirements would merely be to insist that the county assume a political function. What the county chose to do with that political function would be for the county to determine, of course, within the limits suggested above or some modification of them.[18]

[18] The original Aiken bill, S. 2318, 80th Cong., contained this most interesting provision: "Sec. 113. For the purpose of testing any program, or phase thereof, which the Secretary is authorized but not required to carry out, relating to the production, distribution, or utilization of agricultural commodities, or to any other agricultural matter, the Secretary is authorized to select not more than ten counties distributed throughout the area to which such program or phase might be made applicable and make such program or phase applicable to such counties on an experimental basis."

See also "Project 1, Agricultural Adjustments Toward an Efficient Agriculture in the South," *Hearings*, Special sub-committee on cotton, House Committee on Agriculture, H. of R., 80th Cong., 1st Sess., July 7–8, 1947. The calls for "group action," which, obviously, means in large part "political action," and for consideration of "institutional and legal forces" are exactly in line with the thesis of this article. "Group action may facilitate provision of credit. Most people are familiar with coöperative credit institutions and with policies and action programs of the federal government, which facilitate farmers' attempts to obtain needed capital. Constructive policies by governmental agencies, land-owners, and tenants may speed agricultural adjustments on tenant-operated farms. It seems inevitable and probably desirable that considerable tenancy will continue. Land values have been bid up by many owners who are willing to pay high prices and to accept the relatively low rate of return on their investment. Bidding for real estate by non-farm investors has seriously distorted land prices in some locations, compared with value based on capitalized earning capacity. This adds another difficulty for farmers striving to attain ownership of their farms. On the other hand, tenant operation of farms may be used to facilitate development of efficient farming if economically sound tenure policy and renter terms can be formulated, and if procedures can be developed to make available necessary intermediate and short-term credit. Group action also is indicated for adjustments basic to land improvements. In some cases, changes in tax policy are indicated; in others, the need is for general adoption of management practices directed to the desired end. Where approved practices are used in caring for woodlands, including fire protection, not only are rates increased, but the waiting period is shortened. Through such practices, timber becomes one of the lowest risk groups, making possible ample credit at a low rate of interest. Usually, however, the adoption of such practices is dependent upon committee or group action."

"Agricultural policy must, however, take account of the economic and political environment in which it finds itself. Research on policy and programs must thus be realistic and not be developed within a framework of assumptions that disregard institutional and legal forces that are the very essence of agricultural difficulties. Those who formulate and execute public policy could be assisted materially in this very important field of activity by a more adequate research program dealing with the many complex problems involved in this field."

The reports of the Council of Intergovernmental Relations are suggestive of possibilities, particularly the budget devised in Blue Earth county, Minn., and the proposal for a county agricultural committee in Colquitt county, Georgia. But these reports suffer from a lack of clear-cut consideration of local *political* functions in-

Jasper county would then have certain necessary powers and some funds (in the agricultural conservation program) to use judiciously or injudiciously as it might choose to help make its own agricultural adjustments. The county should have technical assistance, from the College of Agriculture at Urbana, from various state departments, from the SCS, etc.; but the program adopted should be the county's own.

This proposal is an improvement over the county land-use planning program of 1938-42. The manner of the bureaucratic and farm organization attack upon that program concealed its chief weakness, which was *an assumption that, if given the benefit of thorough professional analyses of their problems, rural local people would agree as to what should be done.* This is, I think the chief reason why county planning left so little percipitate. County planning was really effective only in those counties, as in the Wenatchee apple area in Washington or in Teton county, Montana, where the problem facing the local people was either radically to adjust or to lose their economic means of support; in consequence, a political consensus naturally appeared which was so strong as, paradoxically, to escape notice! Everybody did agree; but in the great majority of situations, this will not happen. In contrast, the present proposal frankly recognizes that a function of political choice exists.

This illustrative exposition is offered to indicate the shortcomings of the present debate over agricultural administration. It is clear that, although the debate is couched in terms of "federal, state, and local relations," the issues as presented disregard the possibility of *political* decentralization. One would not expect anything else, because of the nature of the groups making representations. Thus the Extension service has not helped to identify the

---

volving the resolution of conflicts of interest. See *Grass Roots; A Report and an Evaluation*, published by the Council, Washington, D. C., 1947, and reports on individual counties. The response of Piatt county, Illinois, to the proposals of E. J. Working and L. J. Norton, wherein the assumption at the county level of discretionary control over agricultural conservation programs was strongly suggested, is dramatically in point. See Working and Norton in *Illinois Farm Economics*, Apr. and May, 1946, and Dec. and Jan., 1946–47, and Norton, *Farm Income and Prices*, American Enterprise Incorp., New York, 1947, p. 33. One should also call attention to the fruitful possibilities of coördinating research in soils with county taxation policy. See Charles E. Kellogg and J. Kenneth Ableiter, *A Method of Rural Land Classification*, Tech. Bull., 469, USDA, Feb., 1935, and Kellogg, "Contributions of Soil Science and Agronomy to Rural Land Classification," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Nov., 1940.

political function. This failure is the harder to attack because it is tied up with Extension's code, the combination of statements of principle that lend significance and prestige to individual Extension workers. The code is largely epitomized in the "two blades of grass" theory. The real underlying assumption here is that there is no necessary conflict in society. Extension will work with individuals (as demonstrators) and with groups willing to coöperate to some common end (although it is true that Extension folk are sometimes disturbed by incipient or real conflicts between coöperatives and private businesses); but Extension generally ignores the political function in its analysis of the needs of agricultural society. Extension "plays politics," of course; in this it is not different from other public agencies. But it should be Extension's rôle to analyze and clarify the action system in its society, with special reference to the rural elements; and this Extension fails to do.

Whatever failure one may attribute to the agricultural extension services of the USDA and the several states is by no means theirs alone. Research in agriculture has rarely been addressed to the *process* of policy formation, *including its political aspects*. Research has been dominated by the natural sciences, which are frequently practiced on the assumption that it is none of the scientist's affair to concern himself with the general sociological and political effects of his findings.[19] Or, quite differently, natural scientists have sometimes been wont to develop general social theories which assume that social problems can be solved by a process of adjustment of human life to the exactions of nature so that harmony emerges.[20]

[19] Cf. Charles E. Kellogg, "The Scientist and Social Policy in the Democratic State," *Scientific Monthly*, May, June, July, 1942.

[20] It is perhaps a little unfair to cite the following as characteristic; yet the concept of man in harmony with nature is so compelling as to be extremely dangerous. Therefore, I quote it to challenge natural scientists in agriculture as to whether it represents, however preciously, their own conscious or sub-conscious philosophies:

"Fair is the land that rims the Tuscarawas, the Conotton, and the McGuire. Quiet, cool, are the dawdling streams. Green, happy, are the cradling slopes. Gentle is the rule of order and discipline. A canoe slices like a whisper across a shaded pool, and a drinking doe mothers her fawn to the protective cover of the brush. Nature smiles the old-young smile of memory and hope.

"Here, where calm waters pile back in a twelve-mile lake from the breast of a man-made dam, a new faith stands to cheer the rising sun. A noble and intelligible faith that moves within a widely-drawn periphery. Here, vigorous and clean as morning dew—and as welcome to the aging throat of civilization—lies upon every leaf and stem a concept of an Earth at peace with itself. Here, Science and Youth move in comradeship with that which is on, and of, the soil." Wellington Link, *Soil Conservation*, Sept., 1944, p. 51.

The harmony they envisage is an organic one, an ecological concept, but it oddly excludes that aspect of "natural" organic relationship characterized by the big fish swallowing the little ones. Even more, this harmony fails to recognize the rôle of conflict and antagonism in society, competition in the market-place, collective bargaining, the struggle for political power, revolution, and war.

At the same time, social science in agriculture has hardly lived up to its responsibilities of analyzing the structure of social action, including its political aspects. Economists have dominated agricultural social science; and, with due recognition of their impressive contributions, economists are prone to assume too much for analysis and planning. Concerned with the maximization of wealth, they frequently wish to treat social action as though by the application of intelligence formulas could be derived with which all would agree; worse, they treat disagreement as bullheadedness and politics as the product of a few extremely perverse individuals who appeal to the childish or illogical (i.e., non-economic) side of human nature.

IV. WANTED—A NEW CONCEPTION

It seems to me that we can improve our grasp of the structure of social action in agriculture within a system of federally-divided powers. This can better be accomplished if we turn away from the abrasive area of "federal-state relationships" to concentrate initially upon the participant associations in agriculture. These associations are farm organizations, the AFBF, the Grange, the Farmers Union, the National Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisers, etc.; they also include land-grant colleges, individually, collectively in the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and their parts, i.e., the state extension services and experiment stations. They include the USDA and agencies within it, for our purposes particularly the SCS and PMA. Others are government organizations, such as TVA, and private organizations, such as bankers' associations.

Such associations are the necessary means of agricultural policy; for example, if one wishes to consider the possible rôle of credit in providing farm enlargement and improvement loans, he must deal with public credit agencies, both with respect to their financial resources and legal authority and responsibilities and also with respect to what Sorokin calls the "law-norms" of the association, or

what in Barnard's terms constitute the set of organizing principles of the associations's code. I suggest that some explanation of the slowness with which public agencies have developed new and needed lines of credit for farm enlargement and improvement purposes reflects the difficulty of adapting Farm Credit Administration personnel to new ways of thinking about the rôle of public credit. The same limitations apply even more to private bankers.[21]

It is not easy for an outsider to attempt to construct codes of associations. Yet the SCS code would seem to contain something like the following. Soil erosion is a national menace. We must save the topsoil. We must develop a technology to achieve this end and an organization to apply the technology. Since the problem is national, a nation-wide organization is called for; since the benefits will be diffuse, a public program is indicated. The technology is sufficiently generalizable, moreover, that national administration appears to follow. For purposes of applying the technology, local contacts are necessary. In order to protect the integrity of the technology, adequate organization and procedures need to be developed. To this end, the land-use capability tables provide a common method of action, and the complete farm plan provides the standard of application in the final analyses. The achievement of organization to fulfill the possibilities of technology requires a high order of technical analysis at the farm level with the technical criticism and control at higher levels. Yet conservation is not altogether an individual farm matter; it may be a watershed or a regional problem; but common action in the United States requires consent and even spontaneity. Moreover, individual soil conservation activities are undertaken in the presence of economic criteria —"How much conservation can I afford on my farm?" And our economic beliefs emphasize the importance of the farmer's individual decisions. Now, how to (a) protect the scientist's integrity, (b) bow to democratic concepts to the degree that conservation is a cammon problem or a social problem, and (c) admit entrepreneurial self-determination? The code allows for all these things. The soil conservation district is to approach the problem in communal fashion; the farmer is to remain his own entrepreneur, adapting technical soil conservation if he wishes and incorporating from *other* agencies what he needs and can get to round out his farm

[21] See note 28 below.

management according to economic criteria. But SCS protects its integrity (subjectively viewed, that is) by defining the manner in which it will coöperate, i.e., the complete farm plan, etc.

The PMA (or AAA) would include: the disadvantaged position of agriculture in its share of the national income—essentially a moral analysis. Farm income is essentially a function of farm prices, which, then, should be supported—and at a "fair" level. In order to support prices, production control may be necessary. For these purposes, public action is required; moreover, public action should reach all farmers so far as possible and should apply alike to all farmers, with whatever modifications or classifications to adapt the program to similarly situated farmers. Then a further leap is made to the conception that public programs for agriculture should be conceived and administered by farmers in the interest of farmers, which is equated with the public interest. Upon this code, conservation was grafted in 1936 (the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act). But conservation is subordinated to the rest of the code; it should be applied universally, and be developed and administered by farmers in the price-supporting, production-controlling organization which, even when farm prices are high, should be kept intact as a hedge against depression.

These attempts to describe codes are at least suggestive of their significance.[22] What we are after is the best possible delineation of agency and associational doctrine, the principles that lend authority to the hierarchy, the network of understandings and common values which permits "representative" statements to be made that with some significant degree of effectiveness carry the weight of collective statements—as though made by all members of the association.

There is also the question of the symmetry of associational codes, the significance of which will, I think, be profound in any comprehensive study of the "action system" in agriculture. By symmetry, I mean the tendency toward logical completeness and consistency in the governing principles of an association. Thus the SCS code, viewed as an ideal type, seems to provide maxims of action governing all elements of conduct of the personnel. This code permits one to know what matters are of professional concern,

[22] For further analysis of codes of Extension and the AFBF, cf. the forthcoming article mentioned in note 10 above.

e.g., the development of agronomic and engineering methods, and what are not, e. g., analyses relating to agricultural marketing. For the former, SCS doctrine either provides an answer which befits one's professional rôle or else permits an answer to be logically deduced, e.g., with respect to the debate over deep plowing. The Forest Service has possessed a code, which has probably been decisively modified at times over the years (e.g., during the period in the 1920's characterized as "Greeleyism"). The Forest Service code appears to permit answers as to the advisability of public regulation of private forests and as to the weight of various factors in determining the optimum combination in a multiple-use forest. I have suggested that PMA's code (the old AAA) includes, but in a sense depreciates, soil conservation. This marks an important aspect of the conflict between SCS and PMA as between two sets of values. This conflict suggests the need for a careful exploration of the possibilities of evolving a common doctrine which will embrace the ideologies of both if the two are to be combined into one agency—as Secretary Anderson and Senator Aiken have proposed, for example. In 1941-42, a combination of the two was attempted, in the short-lived Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Administration, but the two agencies failed to merge. Another useful agency for the study of the evolution of a code would be the Farmers Home Administration (erstwhile Farm Security Administration). There seems to have been a marked change in both program and personnel which accompanied the shift from the resettlement project approach and philosophy to the rehabilitation approach and philosophy about 1936. There is reason to believe that the mixture of relief (the grant program) and rehabilitation sometimes perplexed and frustrated FSA personnel. Pursuant to the Cooley Act, creating the Farmers Home Administration (1946), the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan program of the Farm Credit Administration, together with its personnel, was transferred to FHA. There is some indication that this mixture of philosophies has had an unsettling effect upon the FHA program, as well as upon the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan program.

Further comments could be made respecting the possibility of symmetrical development of agency codes, but these are sufficently illustrative. It should be said that nothing in the concept of the codes precludes the possibility of internal debate as to their contents, as the files of the *Journal of Forestry* eloquently testify for

the Forest Service.[23] It should further be mentioned that the spelling out of codes and, indeed, their tendencies toward symmetry appear frequently to involve questions of technology. The Farm Credit Administration's appraisal system may be a case in point.[24] So may be the "sustained yield management" concept in forestry.[25] A most significant example in the field of conservation is the different development of soil survey techniques by two USDA agencies, the Soil Conservation Service and the Division of Soil Survey, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering.[26]

As part, then, of constructing a new conceptual framework of analysis for agricultural policy, agency and associational codes need examination. Let us remember from the illustration in Jasper county, Illinois, that our problems of understanding and manipulating the structure of social action in agriculture are largely controlled by the necessity for local adaptation. This means that analysis of codes needs to be done not merely nationally but also state by state, and even on an intrastate basis.

This business of getting at the nature of associations requires analysis by sociologists, social psychologists, and students of politics. Some tools need developing from books like Parsons', *Structure of Social Action*, Barnard's *Functions of the Executive*, and Herbert Simon's, *Administrative Behavior*. The approach might be experimental, just as the budget method of farm management enables analyses to be made on the basis of which conservation loans may be more scientifically tried out. Moreover, the experimentation should be closely geared in with extension work in order to be made the subject of communication to farmers.

V. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOCIAL "ENDS" IN AGRICULTURAL POLICY

But suppose an understanding of the nature and inner workings and codes of all relevant associations and agencies might be gained. What measure is possible, or better, what criteria of judgment can

[23] E.g., issues for July and Oct., 1942.

[24] See Karl Brandt, "A Public Farm Land Appraisal Service . . . ," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Aug., 1945.

[25] Kenneth P. Davis, "Development of Forest Practice Controls in the U. S.," *Journal of Forestry*, Nov., 1946, and H. H. Chapman, "Is Selective Cutting a Panacea for Forest Regulation?," *ibid.*, May, 1944.

[26] Although no systematic appraisal has been made of the two methods, see *Soil Science*, Oct., 1947, and Jan., 1949.

be evolved, which will permit society, through its institutionalized methods of public policy formation, to employ its associations and agencies as means? Granted that much social inter-relationship and action is not purposive at all,[27] we must assume a large rôle for setting and attaining ends in agricultural policy. There is nothing new about this in principle; every agricultural policy from the provision of land grants for the establishment of agricultural colleges to recently enacted changes in the parity formula has been purposive. Yet much analysis and clarification of possible social ends in agriculture, especially as these would be made concretely effective in local situations, remains to be done. Moreover, there is reason for attempting to relate these ends to over-riding goals derived from political theory as the maintenance of the "operative ideals," in Lindsay's terminology. Through this procedure, two great accomplishments are possible: first, goals may be clarified so that not merely the coöperative steps to their attainment emerge, but also areas of conflict can be disclosed and issues can be sharpened for political decision; and, second, a means may be found for articulating the norms of organized political communities so as to provide an over-riding check upon the norms or codes of agencies and associations.

It must be strongly emphasized that study of the nature of the associations in agriculture will prove profoundly impressive. When one turns to immediate ends of agricultural policy, whether they involve credit reform, rural electrification, soil conservation, education, research, grants-in-aid to farmers (such as compensatory payments to achieve adjustments), or coöperative purchasing and marketing, the previous excursion into the nature of associations will appear relevant: always organizations, associations, groups will be involved. These latter will tend to have their own corporate personalities. Many of the associations will evince imperialistic tendencies of expansion and comprehension of ever wider fields of service to farmers. Likewise, tendencies to create and strengthen organizations of farmers will be evident. I believe that in this imperialism, in this process of creating loyalty to the agency or association, the development of codes is crucial. Further, such codes embody statements of purposes, associational purposes.

Hence the difficulty of our situation. I have attempted to show

[27] P. Sorokin, *op. cit.*

that the representations of interested associations both distort and under-state the issues involved in the organization of public programs for agriculture. I have suggested both that associations are essential to the evolution and prosecution of public programs in agriculture and also that public policy is purposive. Now I must add that the purposes of public policy may and frequently must conflict with purposes of associations.[28] Thus the question arises: Can the conflict of purposes be reconciled?

One way out of the difficulty appears if we concentrate upon the political process; for politics involves struggle; struggle occurs as conflicts over ends or over the operation of means to ends; ends suggest norms; norms, codes. It ought to be possible to lay down social norms in a manner to clarify the relation of these to associational norms; at any rate, I propose to write "as if" this is possible. Now to the attempt.

Politically organized societies develop what A. D. Lindsay has called "operative ideals" (*The Modern Democratic State*, Vol. 1). Fascism, communism, divine right monarchies, theocracies, democracies, and all the rest do so. These ideals are essential (although not always effective) to the crucial task of "turning force into right and obedience into duty." These ideals are frequently imprinted through social action upon the hearts of individuals, thus changing them into "citizens," as Rousseau would have it. All the dangers of orthodoxy are inherent in this practice, and the religions of nationalism may result.

Yet it is hoped that the content of the ideals may be such as to prevent an intellectual straight-jacket from developing out of them; this is in part the function of *dynamism* as incorporated among the

[28] This has been suggested regarding adaptation of existing credit institutions to the provision of new varieties of credit. It has been suggested regarding the inability of agricultural extension workers, because of their conception of their function, to help clarify the areas of conflict in rural society. It is suggested by strictures against present conservation programs. E.g., Noble Clark, "Long-Range Agricultural Policy," *Hearings*, H. of R., Committee on Agriculture, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., Part 3, May 3, 6, 7, 8, and 29, 1947, at p. 400; Milton Eisenhower, speech, Dec. 15, 1947 (mimeo). See also the Report, Committee on Agricultural Policy, Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, in *Hearings*, "Long-Range Agricultural Policy," H. of R., House Committee on Agriculture, 80th Cong., 2d Sess., Part 15. The historical base in agriculture (in the PMA program) has often been attacked for imposing rigidities. The old FSA program was criticized for propping up uneconomic situations in agriculture, thus preventing needed adjustments. SCS has been criticized for not sufficiently considering the economic position of the farmer, etc., etc.

ideals of democracy as listed below. But, dangerous or not, the ideals are very much with us;[29] and an attempt to state some of those pertinent in our democracy is now in order:

1. Constitutional or limited government; political rights necessary for the existence of an organized opposition.
2. A diffusion of effective political power in society; hence, general educational programs and widespread equality of opportunity.
3. Popular control of the general direction of government; majority rule.
4. A high value upon dynamism; willingness for public experimentation; conditions permitting private and group experimentation.

Consideration of these operative ideals suggests the following as possible immediate goals of agricultural policy:

1. The maintenance of a vigorous agriculture in which family-type farms[30] predominate.

[29] Talcott Parsons has shown how four great social scientists have each been led to the position of emphasizing the importance of social values in understanding social action. See *The Structures of Social Action* (1937). Gunnar Myrdal has made remarkable use of this concept, embodied in the "American Credo," in interpreting the domestic Negro problem in *The American Dilemma*. The writer has adopted Myrdal's method in an analysis of "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics Under Fire; A Study in Valuation Conflicts," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Aug., 1946. The dangers are implicit in a penetrating essay by Leo Strauss, "On the Intention of Rousseau," *Social Research*, Dec., 1947. The dynamic of democracy is illuminated by A. D. Lindsay in his discussion of the changing nature of law and rights incident to the Reformation, e.g., "The state's rules with compulsion behind them represent only that minimum standard of social conduct necessary for order and security, necessary to give room for growth and progress." *Modern Democratic State*, p. 88. This one quotation, taken out of context, should not be interpreted too sweepingly; yet it follows that the system of common values in democracy can allow, within the framework of guaranteed rights, leeway for experimentation and innovation which permits the exfoliation of individual and group purposes. Some social purposes may be realized through governmental means, others may not. See also Reinhold Niebuhr's remarks on Jesus's rejection of Hebraic legalism, *Human Destiny*, pp. 39–40.

[30] A. Whitney Griswold's deflation of the family-farm as the chief bulwark of democracy (in his recent *Farming and Democracy*) is generally well taken; nevertheless, some 27,000,000 U.S. residents are still classed as rural-farm; and it is logical to suppose that their tenurial status, size of holdings, etc., are significant both with respect to their political attitudes and also with regard to the organization of political power. It should be remembered that a *family-type* farm may range from a few acres intensively cultivated for fruit or vegetables to several thousand acres in stock ranches. Nor is owner-operation an essential of family-type farms. I judge that political attitudes vary considerably among farmers according as typical farm organizations vary, e.g., from family-type farms in much of the corn belt, the Lake states, and the northern Great Plains, for example, to characteristic large holdings,

a. These farms should be fairly efficient, in economic terms; i.e., they should not be wards of the state.
b. These farms should have entrepreneurial functions: the objective is to provide the farmer with tools of analysis and data so that he can make operating decisions which he feels are his.
   (1) This does not preclude the development of coöperative marketing services, with the delegation of some decisions, e.g., as when to market hogs and at what weights.
   (2) Nor does it preclude making farm management assistance and technical services available; nor even the requirement that farmers be willing to accept such services in order to get credit, conservation aids, etc.
c. These farms should provide levels of living, or the possibility of attaining levels of living, which include the materialistic elements that we think of as a part of our middle-class culture.

2. The production of the agricultural plant should serve the nutritional needs of the nation.
3. The soil and moisture resources employed in farming should be efficiently used.

These goals of agricultural policy appear to be instrumental to the strengthening and preservation of the operative ideals as already described. Thus the approximation of these goals for agriculture would seem to help:

a. To maintain a diffusion of political power and to increase equality of opportunity;
b. To make this diffusion of political power effective by creating citizens capable of taking fairly "independent" views of political questions;
c. To maintain the dynamic factor in one sector of the economy, since it is presumed that many characteristics of family-type farms will change over the years and that inflows and outflows of population and resources to and from agriculture will be notable.

It may be noted also that the statement of goals represents a practical balance between the ideal of diffusion of political power and the ideal of "efficiency" as part of the concept of dynamism.

Other analyses could be presented on the basis of a different set

---

e.g., in parts of California, Arizona, or in cane-sugar areas. I have a preference for the political attitudes of family-size farmers, however much this preference may rest merely on scattered observations, conversations, and hunches.

of assumptions. A strict criterion of efficiency in agriculture might assert the need for agricultural labor to be employed as efficiently as labor outside agriculture, i.e., for a rapid approximation of equality between per capita incomes in agriculture and outside. This might mean mechanization of many farms, considerable farm enlargement, and the development of types of farms which, under varying circumstances, would be the most efficient in using the human agent of production. The family-size farm would be abandoned as a goal, except as it proved itself equally economic as, or more economic than, coöperative, corporation, or other large-scale farms. It seems clear that this modification would involve as much choice respecting any political values connected with family-size farms as the earlier formulation would; in the present concept, these political values would merely be brushed aside; but as much choice is involved in rejection as in confirmation.

Moreover, it would be possible to spell out operative political ideals in terms of a concept of gradations in human capabilities for political as well as for economic or technical performance. This might lead to the overt recognition of the aristocratic features in the present society and an effort to emphasize and further develop these. Instead of assuming that the state should modify its assistance to the ablest (or most fortunate) in order to have an equalizing effect, the assumption would frankly be that the state's assistance should be granted in proportion to the ability of the recipient. In short, in agriculture one should remove all limitations upon ACP payments, remove the 160-acre limit in the reclamation program of Interior, and depart from the principle of the historical base and allotments of minimum acreages, in order to assist the shift of agricultural production to lands best suited for it and to the most capable operators. Presumably, the graduated income tax would have to be modified, and there should be no more talk of graduated land taxes nor laws to penalize or ostracize corporation farming.

This approach would appear logically to be combined with the development of a philosophy of "my station and its duties," including a heavy dose of *noblesse oblige*. It would be perfectly in accord with the views of certain large farmers who have expressed the ideal to me of a patriarchal society in which the ablest possessed the land and "cared for" the indigent, the stupid, the indolent, and the thriftless. It might be combined further with political reforms

to add educational qualifications for electors as well as, perhaps, plural voting, as recommended by J. S. Mill.

This formulation would be compatible with the earlier one in that both would allow for constitutionalism, including alike the principle of limitations upon the current administration and provisions for safeguarding individual liberties of person, speech, entrance into businesses, and freedom of association, although this last might have to be limited lest the collective importunacies of what Schumpeter calls "the great enemy of society, the subnormal,"[31] disturb the efficiency of the economic order.

Both the approaches suggested above can find justification in present agricultural programs. If the family-size farm has been a goal of much agricultural policy (witness the Homestead Act and, in a sense, minimum allotments and payments and even the historical base of the AAA), it is also true that much public assistance in agriculture is designed and has the effect of giving to "him that hath." Thus in the AAA (PMA) program, some twenty per cent of the farmers get sixty per cent of the payments. The Farm Credit Administration operates to provide favorable credit conditions and terms to commercial farmers. Marketing programs obviously favor the commercial farmers, especially those who, constituting a third of all farmers, supply some eighty per cent of the commercial agricultural product.[32] Generally speaking, agricultural research and extension have most benefited those farmers already in better financial position than their neighbors.

What is important, therefore, is not the evolution of a rigid set of operative ideals and inexorable deductions therefrom for agricultural policy, but rather recognition of the importance of clarifying the goals of agricultural policy and the relation of these to operative ideals. It is the farmer's responsibility to adopt or reject improved methods of farming as developed and demonstrated to him by agricultural research and extension. It is likewise the farmer-citizen's responsibility, along with other citizens, and acting through institutionalized political processes, to make his choices as to public policy in the light of the purposes he wishes to serve. It is certainly equally the responsibility of research and extension to

[31] *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, p. 213. This group constitutes, according to Schumpeter, "a great fringe of perhaps 25 per cent of the population."

[32] But cf. Noble Clark's qualifying remarks, *op. cit.*, p. 394.

clarify the issues for choice as much as possible. But, in contrast to their yeoman service in the natural science field and also in farm management, agricultural scientists have failed to provide political analyses.

VI. THE CHALLENGE TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

From all this, the challenge to political science is clear. There is a vast field of study in the process of policy formation and execution in agriculture. It is a study which cries out for intensive local application and adaptation. It appears impossible to develop national policies which automatically serve to redress such situations as exist in Jasper county without a large measure of local adaptation, including the making of political decisions which, wherever their origin, must be applied locally and in detail. At the risk of laboring the obvious, it may be pointed out that collective action to conserve the soil (e.g., to cope with wind erosion and the practice of plowing up land which should be left in grass) may be necessary in some areas and not in others. Here, drainage problems may present issues for political choice; there, irrigation; here, credit presents one kind of issue; there, another. Here, the size of farms is a crucial problem; there, it is serious; elsewhere, it is minor. Here, the property tax and its administration represent barriers to adjustment in land-use; there, these may be negligible. Tenure problems are many and various.

Armed with the tools of their profession, political scientists can attack problems of agricultural policy by exploring the possibilities of political action at various levels. If we are really to plumb the possibilities of *political* decentralization of agricultural policy, where else can we turn for analyses of the capabilities and shortcomings of various units of government, for studies of public opinion in agriculture as related to the problems of formulating and executing policy, or for studies of the possible means of administrative arrangements for the joint prosecution by two or more units of government of a public function?

At the same time, political scientists can insist upon analyses which show the areas not only of coöperation but of conflict and consequent necessity of political choice. This means, I think, the effort to articulate possible social ends, both immediate ones of agricultural policy and more ultimate ones connected with the pres-

ervation of the operative ideals of democracy. When we attempt to relate associations to the community politically organized, it appears necessary to examine associational codes as they relate to the achievement of broader social purposes. If, for example, private banks reject proposals that they provide new lines of credit which analyses indicate as helpful to the end of agricultural adjustment, yet oppose provision of such credit by public agencies, it may be logical to carry the analysis of proposal, refusal, and consequences into the realm of high public policy characterized by maintenance of operative ideals. If soil conservation is expanded and expounded to embrace a general social philosophy from which canons of social action are rigidly deducible,[33] then the argument should be met on its own grounds, which require consideration of political theory. I am conscious of the worth of Herring's warning against the frequent invocation of high political principles, but I cannot see how otherwise the challenge of associational authority and loyalty to wider political authority and loyalty can be met.[34] Finally, I should go so far as to suggest that those whose public purposes tend to reproduce the rationalization of the interests of their dominant associations may unwittingly personify social dangers. They may prove more amenable to *gleichschaltung* than citizens accustomed to the exercise of political functions in decentralized political units.[35]

The suggested approach appears more fruitful than attempting to take hold of the problem as one of "federal-state relations," which implies acceptance of the terms of the argument as laid down by interested groups and agencies. But the principle of federalism will receive due attention. For example, respecting the implementation of public programs, one must consider units of government with legal power and resources to act. This means not only national power but state power and the extension of state power in organized

[33] See Hugh Hammond Bennett, "Development of Natural Resources; the Coming Technological Revolution on the Land," *Science*, Jan. 3, 1947. Cf. discussion by Charles M. Hardin in *Land Policy Forum*, Oct., 1948.

[34] *Politics of Democracy*. One would not expect the argument on the basis of high principle to be continuous; there will, no doubt, be many moments of recession and subsidence of aroused public interest. I am largely concerned with further developing that decentralization of conflicts which Herring commends on p. 409.

[35] I am constrained to add that these strictures imply no personal criticisms; though one must frequently deal in personalities, the effort should be to understand the sociological influences at work. Cf. Max Weber, *op. cit.*

countries. Thus, analysis directed toward the possibility of political decentralization in agriculture must turn to the question of the scope of authority of counties, the reform of the property tax, and tenure legislation. All these are at present preëminently, and some of them exclusively, state functions as against national functions. In this fashion, state-local relations, federal-state relations, and federal-local relations are approached, but not in the first instance—rather, as it becomes logical to consider them in a systematic analysis of agricultural policy formation and execution.

VII. CHALLENGE TO AGRICULTURAL STATESMEN AND ADMINISTRATORS

I am aware that proposals for decentralization of functions to counties will elicit many hearty guffaws. Nevertheless, the tremendous development of positive agricultural policy, even to the extent of controlling production on individual farms, stares us in the face. So does the remarkable proliferation of associations in rural society. As I have tried to show, these developments call for a variety of local adaptation, including the creation of means for local political choices to be made—preferably, I think, locally. With all the shortcomings of counties that have been exhaustively shown by students, these units seem the logical ones for exercising important local political functions respecting programs for agriculture.

If we can have as rapid a development of political science research and extension in agriculture as has occurred in agricultural economics and rural sociology since 1925, there is much hope that rural social analysis may find the missing part that will raise the entire level of its approach to comprehensive consideration of rural action systems. I have emphasized the impossibility of ruling out politics, and I have tried to show what the introduction of political research would entail.

This puts the issue squarely up to land-grant college presidents and deans and directors of agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and extension services; to farm organization leaders; to officials in the USDA; and to congressmen and senators. Some of these men are friendly to the introduction of political science into agricultural research and education; others are somewhat favorably disposed, but skeptical; others are disinterested or antagonistic. Yet the foregoing analysis indicates the impressive shortcomings of

current analyses of issues in agricultural public policy organization. It also indicates the *possibility* of extremely significant contributions from political science in these fields.

I say *possibility* because I am quite aware of the extreme degree of rationality implied by the foregoing analysis. One is often reminded of Tolstoy's characterization of Czar Alexander's brain-truster, Speransky, who never considered that all he thought and all he believed might not be meaningless nonsense. Whether the rigors of national agricultural policy and the requirements of national accountability for the expenditure of federal funds will allow the devolution of a significant range of discretion to local political units is doubtful. Whether issues can be clarified for local political decision and sufficient power created at the county level to cope with these issues is highly debatable. Whether a political process can be so analyzed and understood as to evolve political ends that become effective criteria for controlling the vigorous self-serving propensities of associations remains to be proved. But proof cannot be had without trial; and I believe that I have at least suggested cogent reasons, in the shortcomings of present organization in agriculture as well as in the inadequacy of present analyses of agricultural organization, for the trial being made.

ABSOLUTISM AND RELATIVISM IN PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS*

HANS KELSEN
University of California

Since there exists philosophy, there exists the attempt to bring it in relation with politics; and this attempt has succeeded in so far as it is today recognized to the degree of a truism that political theory and that part of philosophy we call ethics are closely connected with each other. But it seems strange to assume—and this essay tries to verify this assumption—that there exists an external parallelism, and perhaps also an inner relationship, between politics and other parts of philosophy such as epistemology, that is, theory of knowledge, and theory of values. It is just within these two theories that the antagonism between philosophical absolutism and relativism has its seat; and this antagonism seems to be in many respects analogous to the fundamental opposition between autocracy and democracy as the representatives of political absolutism on the one hand and political relativism on the other.[1]

I

Philosophical absolutism is the metaphysical view that there is an absolute reality, i.e., a reality that exists independently of human knowledge. Hence its existence is objective and unlimited in, or beyond, space and time, to which human knowledge is restricted. Philosophical relativism, on the other hand, advocates the empirical doctrine that reality exists only within human knowledge, and that, as the object of knowledge, reality is relative to the knowing subject. The absolute, the thing in itself, is beyond human experience; it is inaccessible to human knowledge and therefore unknowable.

To the assumption of absolute existence corresponds the possibility of absolute truth and absolute values, denied by philosophical relativism, which recognizes only relative truth and relative values. Only if the judgments about reality refer ultimately to an objective existence may they aim at absolute truth; that is to say,

* The author wishes to thank the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* for permission to use in this essay some passages of an article "Absolutism, political," which he wrote for the *Encyclopaedia*. The article has not yet been published.

[1] Cf. Hans Kelsen, *Staatsform und Weltanschauung* (Tübingen, 1933).

claim to be true not only in relation to the judging subject but to everybody, always and everywhere. If there is an absolute reality, it must coincide with absolute value. The absolute necessarily implies perfection. Absolute existence is identical with absolute authority as the source of absolute values. Value judgments can claim to be valid for everybody, always and everywhere, and not only in relation to the judging subject, if they refer to values inherent in an absolute reality or, what amounts to the same, are established by an absolute authority. The personification of the absolute, its presentation as the omnipotent creator of the universe whose will is the law of nature as well as of man, is the inevitable consequence of philosophical absolutism. Its metaphysics shows an irresistible tendency towards monotheistic religion; whereas philosophical relativism, as anti-metaphysical empiricism insists upon the unintelligibility of the absolute as a sphere beyond experience, and consequently has an outspoken inclination to skepticism.

The hypothesis of philosophical absolutism that there is an absolute existence independent of human knowledge leads to the assumption that the function of knowledge is merely to reflect, like a mirror, the objects existing in themselves; whereas relativistic epistemology, in its most consistent presentation by Kant, interprets the process of cognition as the creation of its object. This view implies that the human subject of knowledge is—epistemologically—the creator of his world, a world which is constituted exclusively in and by his knowledge. Hence, freedom of the knowing subject is a fundamental prerequisite of the relativistic theory of knowledge. This, of course, does not mean that the process of cognition has an arbitrary character. There are laws governing this process; but these laws originate in the human mind, the subject of knowledge being the autonomous law-giver. Philosophical absolutism, on the other hand, if consistent, must conceive of the subject of knowledge as completely determined by heteronomous laws immanent in objective reality, and as subjected to the absolute, especially if the absolute is imagined as a personal being and superhuman authority.

The subjectivistic character of the relativistic theory of knowledge involves two perils. The one is a paradoxical solipsism; that is, the assumption that the *ego* as the subject of knowledge is the only existent reality. Such assumption would involve a relativistic epistemology in a self-contradiction. For if the *ego* is the only ex-

istent reality, it must be an absolute reality. The other danger is a no less paradoxical pluralism. Since the world exists only in the knowledge of the subject, according to this view, the *ego* is, so to speak, the center of his own world. If, however, the existence of many *egos* must be admitted, the consequence seems to be inevitable that there are as many worlds as there are knowing subjects. Philosophical relativism deliberately avoids solipsism as well as pluralism. Taking into consideration—as true relativism—the mutual relation among the various subjects of knowledge, this theory compensates its inability to secure the objective existence of the one and same world for all subjects by the assumption that the individuals, as subjects of knowledge, are equal. This assumption implies that also the various processes of cognition in the minds of the subjects are equal, and thus the further assumption becomes possible that the objects of knowledge, as the results of these individual processes, are in conformity with one another, an assumption confirmed by the external behavior of the individuals. From the point of view of philosophical absolutism, on the other hand, it is not the equality of the subjects; it is, on the contrary, their fundamental inequality in relation to the absolute and supreme being which is essential.

II

In politics, the term "absolutism" designates a form of government where the whole power of the state is concentrated in one single individual, namely, the ruler, whose will is law. All the other individuals are subjected to the ruler, without participating in his power, which, for this reason, is unlimited and in this sense absolute. Political absolutism means for the ruled complete lack of individual freedom. It is incompatible with the idea of equality because justifiable only by the assumption of an essential difference between the ruler and the ruled. Political absolutism is synonymous with despotism, dictatorship, autocracy. In the past, the characteristic example is the absolute monarchy as it existed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Europe, especially in France under Louis XIV, who formulated its idea in the famous pharse: *L'État c'est moi.* In our time, political absolutism is realized in the totalitarian states as established by fascism, national socialism, and bolshevism. Its opposite is democracy based on the principles of freedom and equality. These principles exclude the establishment

of a totalitarian, i.e., an unlimited, and in this sense, absolute, power of the state, which from a democratic point of view is characterized by the formula *L'État c'est nous.*

The parallelism which exists between philosophical and political absolutism is evident. The relationship between the object of knowledge, the absolute, and the subject of knowledge, the individual human being, is quite similar to that between an absolute government and its subjects. Just as the unlimited power of this government is beyond any influence on the part of its subjects, who are bound to obey laws without participating in their creation, the absolute is beyond our experience, and the object of knowledge—in the theory of philosophical absolutism—independent of the subject of knowledge, totally determined in his cognition by heteronomous laws. Philosophical absolutism may very well be characterized as epistemological totalitarianism. According to this view, the constitution of the universe has certainly not a democratic character.

There exists not only an external parallelism between political and philosophical absolutism; the former has in fact the unmistakable tendency to use the latter as ideological instrument. To justify his unlimited power and the unconditional submission of all the others, the ruler must present himself, directly or indirectly, as authorized by the only true absolute, the supreme superhuman being, as his descendant or deputy or as inspired by him in a mystical way. Where the political ideology of an autocratic and totalitarian government does not permit recourse to the absolute of a historic religion, as in the case of bolshevism, it shows an unconcealed disposition to assume itself a religious character by absolutizing its basic value: the idea of socialism.

Political absolutism not only uses a metaphysical ideology for its practical purposes, i.e., its moral justification; it has also a political theory at its disposal which describes the state as an absolute entity existing independently of its subjects. According to this theory, the state is not merely a group of individuals; it is more than the sum-total of its subjects. It is a collective, and that means here a super-individual, body which is even more real than its members, a mystic organism and as such a supreme and super-human authority, whose visible representative or incarnation is the ruler, whether he be called monarch, Führer, or Generalissimo. It is the concept of sovereignty serving the purpose of this deification of the state which implies the worship of the ruler as a god-like

being. In relation to other states, the dogma of sovereignty leads to the negation of international law as a legal order above the states, that is to say, as a set of rules imposing obligations and conferring rights upon the states and thus determining the spheres of their legal existence. Sovereignty, in the sense of absolute supreme authority, can be the quality of one state only. By voluntarily recognizing international law, the sovereign state incorporates these legal rules into its own law and thus extends the validity of its national law, comprising the international law, over all the other states or, what amounts to the same, over all the other national legal orders. The view that international law is part of one's own national law is advocated by those who insist upon the sovereignty of their own state, and who take it for granted that legal interpretation of facts is identical with interpretation according to their national law, that is, the law of their own state. This juristic imperialism is usually not consistent enough to admit that by this interpretation the own state of the interpreter becomes the sole and absolute legal authority, the god in the world of law.[2]

III

Diametrically opposed to this absolutistic theory of the state is the one which conceives of the state as a specific relation among individuals, established by a legal order or, what amounts to the same, as a community of human beings constituted by this order, the national legal order. In rejecting the sovereignty dogma, this relativistic doctrine considers the state as subject, together with all the other states, to the international legal order. In their subjection to international law, all states are equal and members of the international community constituted by international law. According to this view, the state is certainly a legal authority; but not a supreme authority, since it is essentially under the authority of international law. But this law is created, in a thoroughly democratic way, by custom and treaties, that is, by the coöperation of the states subjected to it. As a legal community, the state exists together with all the other states within the international community under international law, just as private corporations exist within the state under national law. Thus the state represents only an intermediate stage between the international community and the vari-

[2] Cf. Hans Kelsen, *General Theory of Law and State* (Harvard University Press, 1946), pp. 419 ff.

ous legal communities established under the state in accordance with its national law. The relativization of the state is one of the essential objectives of this political theory. It may be characterized as a democratic theory of the state, because it reflects the spirit of democracy. For, just as autocracy is political absolutism and political absolutism is paralleled by philosophical absolutism, democracy is political relativism which has its counterpart in philosophical relativism.

It might be taken for a more or less superficial analogy between democracy and relativism that the fundamental principles of freedom and equality are characteristic of both; that the individual is politically free in so far as he participates in the creation of the social order to which he is subjected, just as the knowing subject—according to relativistic epistemology—is autonomous in the process of cognition; and that the political equality of the individuals corresponds to the equality of the subjects of knowledge, which relativistic epistemology must assume in order to avoid solipsism and pluralism. But a more serious argument for the relationship between democracy and relativism is the fact that almost all outstanding representatives of a relativistic philosophy were politically in favor of democracy, whereas followers of philosophical absolutism, the great metaphysicians, were in favor of political absolutism and against democracy.[3]

IV

It is well known that in antiquity the sophists were relativists. Their most prominent philosopher, Protagoras, taught: Man is the measure of all things; and their representative poet, Euripides, glorified democracy. But Plato, the greatest metaphysician of all times, proclaimed against Protagoras: God is the measure of all things, and, at the same time, rejected democracy as a contemptible form of government. His ideal state is a perfect autocracy.[4] In Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, the absolute appears as "the first mover who is itself unmoved" and stands as a monarch over the universe. Consequently the philosopher presents in his *Politics* the hereditary monarchy as superior to democracy.[5] His teleological interpreta-

[3] Cf. Bertrand Russell, *Philosophy and Politics* (1947), *passim*.

[4] Cf. Hans Kelsen, "Platonic Justice," *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 48 (1937), pp. 367 ff.

[5] Hans Kelsen, "The Philosophy of Aristotle and the Hellenic-Macedonian Policy," *Ethics*, Vol. 48 (1937), pp. 1 ff.

tion of nature—a consequence of his metaphysics—is in direct opposition to the mechanistic view of the atomists, who strictly rejected causes which were simultaneously ends and thus became the founders of modern science. It was not by chance that Democritus, who together with Leucippus developed the anti-metaphysical theory of atoms, declared: "Poverty in democracy is as preferable to pretended prosperity in monarchy as freedom is to slavery."

In the Middle Ages, the metaphysics of the Christian religion goes hand in hand with the conviction that monarchy, the image of the divine rule of the universe, is the best form of government. Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* and Dante Alighieri's *De Monarchia* are the classical examples for this coincidence of philosophical and political absolutism. But Nicolaus Cusanus, who in his philosophy declared the absolute as unknowable, in his political theory, couched a lance for the freedom and the equality of men. In modern times, Spinoza combined his anti-metaphysical pantheism with an outspoken preference for democratic principles in the moral and political fields; but the metaphysician Leibniz defended monarchy. The English founders of anti-metaphysical empiricism were decided opponents of political absolutism. Locke affirmed that absolute monarchy was inconsistent with civil society and could be no form of government at all. Hume, who much more than Kant deserves to be called the destroyer of metaphysics, it is true, did not go as far as Locke; but he wrote in his brilliant essay, "Of the Original Contract," that the consent of the people is the best and most sacred foundation of government, and in his essay, "Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth," he sketched the constitution of a democratic republic. Kant, following Hume, showed in his philosophy of nature the futility of any metaphysical speculation, but in his ethics he reintroduced the absolute, which he so systematically excluded from his theoretical philosophy. Likewise, his political attitude was not very consistent. He sympathized with the French Revolution and admired Rousseau; but he lived under the absolute monarchy of the Prussian police state and had to be cautious in his political statements. So in his political theory he did not dare express his true opinion. Hegel, on the other hand, the philosopher of the absolute and objective spirit, was also a protagonist of the absolute monarchy.

V

It was a disciple of Hegel who, in the fight against the demo-

cratic movement in Germany during the nineteenth century, formulated the catchword: Authority, not majority! And indeed, if one believes in the existence of the absolute, and consequently in absolute values, in the absolute good—to use Plato's terminology—is it not meaningless to let a majority vote decide what is politically good? To legislate, and that means to determine the contents of a social order, not according to what objectively is the best for the individuals subject to this order, but according to what these individuals, or their majority, rightly or wrongly believe to be their best—this consequence of the democratic principles of freedom and equality is justifiable only if there is no absolute answer to the question as to what is the best, if there is no such a thing as an absolute good. To let a majority of ignorant men decide instead of reserving the decision to the only one who, in virtue of his divine origin, or inspiration, has the exclusive knowledge of the absolute good—this is not the most absurd method if it is believed that such knowledge is impossible and that, consequently, no single individual has the right to enforce his will upon the others. That value judgments have only relative validity, one of the basic principles of philosophical relativism, implies that opposite value judgments are neither logically nor morally impossible. It is one of the fundamental principles of democracy that everybody has to respect the political opinion of everybody else, since all are equal and free. Tolerance, minority rights, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought, so characteristic of democracy, have no place within a political system based on the belief in absolute values. This belief irresistibly leads—and has always led—to a situation in which the one who assumes to possess the secret of the absolute good claims to have the right to impose his opinion as well as his will upon the others who are in error. And to be in error is, according to this view, to be wrong, and hence punishable. If, however, it is recognized that only relative values are accessible to human knowledge and human will, then it is justifiable to enforce a social order against reluctant individuals only if this order is in harmony with the greatest possible number of equal individuals, that is to say, with the will of the majority. It may be that the opinion of the minority, and not the opinion of the majority, is correct. Solely because of this possibility, which only philosophical relativism can admit—that what is right today may be wrong tomorrow—the minority must have a chance to express freely their opinion and must have full opportunity of becoming the majority. Only if it is not possible

to decide in an absolute way what is right and what is wrong is it advisable to discuss the issue and, after discussion, to submit to a compromise.

This is the true meaning of the political system which we call democracy, and which we may oppose to political absolutism only because it is political relativism.

VI

In the eighteenth chapter of the Gospel of Saint John, the trial of Jesus is described. The simple story in its naïve wording is one of the sublimest pieces of world literature and, without intending it, grows into a tragic symbol of the antagonism between absolutism and relativism.

It was at the time of Passover when Jesus, accused of pretending to be the Son of God and King of the Jews, was brought before Pilate, the Roman procurator. And Pilate ironically asked him, who in the eyes of the Roman was but a poor fool, "Then, you are the king of the Jews?" But Jesus took this question very seriously, and, burning with the ardor of his divine mission, answered: "You say so. I am a king. To this end I was born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is on the side of the truth listens to my voice." Then Pilate asked, "What is truth?" And because he, the skeptical relativist, did not know what the truth was, the absolute truth in which this man believed, he—quite consistently—proceeded in a democratic way by putting the decision of the case to a popular vote. He went out again to the Jews, relates the Gospel, and said to them: "I find in him no fault at all. But you have a custom that I should release to you one at the Passover. Do you wish that I set free to you this king of the Jews?" Then cried they all again, saying: "Not this man, but Barabbas." The Gospel adds: "Now Barabbas was a robber."

For those who believe in the Son of God and King of the Jews as witness of the absolute truth, this plebiscite is certainly a strong argument against democracy. And this argument we political scientists must accept. But only under one condition: that we are as sure of our political truth, to be enforced, if necessary, with blood and tears—that we are as sure of our truth as was, of his truth, the Son of God.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

THE APPLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES TO INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION*

DONALD C. STONE

Director of Administration, Economic Coöperation Administration

When we consider the problem of governments collaborating through international organizations, we tend to think only in terms of foreign policy and of issues involving conflict among countries. This is, of course, natural since these are the questions uppermost in the news. But there is another side to international collaboration. If international organizations are to be successful in dealing with world problems, the policy organs through which negotiations are conducted and the secretariats which handle the administrative work must be properly organized and administered. Successful international administration depends upon efficient organization and management, much like any governmental or private endeavor depends upon them.

I. THREE ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Present international organizations, as the very name implies, are based upon the membership of sovereign states. We have not yet achieved agencies of world government. For this reason, there are significant political and structural differences between those international organizations, on the one hand, and other governmental and private institutions, on the other. International organizations must first create effective organs to facilitate the process of negotiation, policy formulation, and other legislative or policy-deciding functions.

The organs of negotiation need special services and other administrative arrangements that are organized under what we know as international secretariats. Unless the secretariat of an international agency is effectively organized and managed, the work of the policy and negotiating organs is impaired, and the agency will tend to remain static and unproductive. Conversely, a dynamic secretariat can go far in helping the representative bodies to reach agreement and to assure national implementation. Within the secretariats of international organizations, we encounter all the problems of administrative management found in any national organization, and some others in addition.

There is a third aspect of international administration. The quality of administration of national governments has a profound effect upon the

* Prepared for and submitted to the Eighth International Management Congress, Stockholm, Sweden, 1947.

efficiency of international agencies. Not only is it necessary that delegations consist of competent persons; it is also necessary that the delegations be backed up by effective organizations at home to provide them with necessary policy guide lines and instructions. Here we encounter the problem of how national governments can be mobilized to conduct foreign relations and to deal effectively through international agencies. Since international agreements are ineffective unless carried out by member governments, high achievement through international agencies depends upon competent management of national affairs.

The effective conduct of international administration today requires progress on all three of these fronts: (1) the organizational arrangements for the conduct of negotiations, (2) the administration of the secretariats of international agencies, and (3) the organization and management of national governments.

Improved administration must be attempted in the midst of a substantial proliferation of international agencies—the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the International Labor Office, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Health Organization, and others.

Fortunately, the structure and functioning of all these international organizations are still in the developmental stages, and both national and international officials are seeking to improve them. Moreover, there is increasing recognition of the fact that even though we achieve international agreement on important matters of political and economic policy, poor administration of international and national agencies will endanger the effectuation of international policy on which so many hopes rest.

II. RESOURCES FOR IMPROVING ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

It is also fortunate that we already possess a substantial body of knowledge and experience on which to base future efforts to improve the varied aspects of international organization. The experience of the League of Nations, the International Labor Office, and a number of lesser bodies has served to identify the requisites of effective management in international bodies. Unfortunately, however, only a small part of the written material concerning these organizations has been directed to administrative arrangements and processes.

During World War II, we witnessed the successful administration of highly complex and far-flung international operations. Organizations were developed for the international allocation of productive resources, raw materials, and food, and for other coöperative efforts among the United

Nations. And even before the liberation of enemy-occupied countries, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established by 44 nations and began to cope with unprecedented problems of international administration. We possess, further, an impressive body of knowledge on which to draw, growing out of the experience of public and industrial management in different national environments.

Those of us who have worked in the field of administration know that the principles of scientific management are generic in character. That is, they are applicable wherever organized activities are carried on. I have found no support for the contention that international administration is fundamentally different in nature from any other kind of administration. It is always necessary, of course, in transferring administrative experience from smaller to larger enterprises, from one level of government to another, or from one cultural environment to another, to interpret such experience in the light of different conditions.

International administrators need more flexibility—more ability to adjust—than do administrators at any other level. They must attempt a synthesis of the best administrative practices and management experience from all world cultures. They must be aware of the administrative contribution that each country can make, and of the fact that nations must recognize something familiar in the structure, staff, and methods of an international organization in order to feel a sense of participation in it.

III. THE OVER-ALL PROBLEM OF ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Looking at the problem of international administration in its broader aspects, we can see some of the complexities in the United Nations structure. The United Nations consists of a General Assembly in which all member countries are represented. This is the nearest equivalent to a general "legislative body."

Next there is the Security Council, consisting of the Soviet Union, China, United Kingdom, France, and the United States of America as permanent members and six other countries elected by the General Assembly for a two-year period. The Economic and Social Council, a principal organ which functions generally under the surveillance of the Assembly, consists of 18 members elected by the Assembly. The Trusteeship Council at present consists of 10 members, some of which participate because of their relationship to trust territories or their permanent status on the Security Council and others of which are elected by the General Assembly.

Then there are other special bodies such as the Atomic Energy Commission, and a number of commissions and subcommissions functioning under the Economic and Social Council. They consist of 12 or more

representatives of national governments. Servicing all of these bodies is the Secretariat, under the direction of the Secretary-General.

Further to complicate the international organization structure, the postwar world demanded that intergovernmental organizations be set up before it was possible to digest fully our war and prewar coöperative experience and work out a unified system. The several specialized agencies which I have mentioned, and certain regional agencies, have been established by separate agreement and have their own governing bodies and secretariats. We must not ignore the fact that the framework of international coöperation is atomistic. If the international structure becomes too cumbersome or expensive, or if its administration is weak or inept, the interest of member nations may wane and the organizations lose their potency.

It is clear that political, jurisdictional, and technical confusion and overlapping will arise among the aggregation of international organizations unless some central focus and strong coördinating influence can be developed and made effective. This is especially true since the various functional agencies appear "program-minded." They were initiated by and received their support from different special interest groups in member nations; their national constituencies espouse commendable ends, but to a much lesser degree comprehend United Nations objectives as a whole and the administrative management means to those ends.

The concept of a national government assumes the conveyance upon government by the citizens of a broad mandate and of the power to enforce that mandate. International organizations have a less stable basis, and there is usually far less political agreement as to general objectives. This is an important distinction. The national administrator can generally count on relatively definite assignments or frames of references and (especially in parliamentary governments) relatively full support from the legislative body. We are not that far advanced in the international field. The administrator here is more frequently confronted with vague directives and compromise agreements, with wide differences of national outlooks, and the possibility of strong minority views. His mandate stems back to the tenuous support of sovereign governments, rather than directly to citizens.

Another major organizational problem is found in the relationships between the executive and the political-policy bodies. With respect to the proper position for the executive in the international organization, we encounter many differences of opinion. Is the chief administrator to operate in the full sense of that title and to develop into a chief executive, or is he to be merely a "chief clerk"? Will he function under the direction of a board standing between him and the general representative body? What controls should be instituted over him?

Granted that no one pattern can be suggested for all international organizations and that no one national viewpoint should be accepted, there is still too little appreciation of the importance of executive leadership in international agencies. The UN Charter represents considerable progress over that of the League of Nations in this respect. The Secretary-General is given implicitly important functions of political as well as administrative leadership. In many of the specialized agencies, the position of the chief administrator is less clear-cut. The establishment of a true executive must, of course, await the attainment of at least some measure of world government.

The constitutions of several of the specialized international organizations provide for an executive board or equivalent body to supervise the administrator between meetings of the general representative body. In two cases, such boards function full time. The frequent need for interim decisions on policy questions can be appreciated, but here we see clearly the dangers in the functioning of such boards. Sometimes, for lack of well defined policy functions, they tend to interfere in the administrative process. Indeed, the question can be raised as to whether it is possible for such a board to be in session full time without impairing the responsibilities of the administrator. Further study and adjustment of this problem will be necessary in the years ahead.

The extent to which the representative body of international agencies "legislates" on administrative matters is a related aspect of this question of executive-representative body relationships. Although international representative bodies are generally vague in their policy decisions, these bodies tend to be far too specific in administrative matters. I am not referring here to the specification of program or policy, but to the prescription in detail of the administrative organization and procedures for carrying out the program. Even in national governments, legislative enactments on administrative matters are seldom suitable for immediate administrative needs, and they inevitably become an obstacle as conditions alter. Organization is never static; it must change ceaselessly to fit evolving political, social, and technical developments and to harness most effectively the participants in it. In international agencies, where representative bodies meet relatively infrequently, administrative flexibility is of the utmost importance.

After considerable debate, the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly of the United Nations in its first meeting decided that the Secretary-General should be given wide latitude for molding the organization of the Secretariat in a manner he should deem most appropriate in the light of experience. Since then, the tendency has been for delegates to press for adoption of resolutions which would impose on the Secretary-General specific methods for carrying out his duties.

In this connection, mention should be made of a device found in the League of Nations and reinstituted in slightly modified form in the United Nations. This is a standing expert committee on administrative and budgetary matters, responsible to the Assembly—known in the League as the Supervisory Committee, and in the UN as the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The primary function of this committee is to review the budget as prepared by the Secretary-General and to render advice on administrative, personnel, and budgetary questions. This has the great advantage of aiding the national representatives participating in the Assembly to reach an informed decision on the level of broad policy and to avoid detailed instructions to the chief executive.

IV. INTERNAL ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

Within the context of the broad problems mentioned above, let us examine how the elements of management are applied to the internal operation of an international secretariat. Although the operations may differ, the environment may require novel approaches, and unusual obstacles may confront him, the international administrator must cope with the same steps and processes as any other executive in developing an effective institution.

Elements of Management. As in any other establishment, the chief administrator of an international agency must plan the program and schedule its work and activities, including sequences and priorities. In this process the representative bodies usually play a larger part in international agencies than in other types of organizations.

In the light of agreed objectives, services, and activities, the administrator plans the form of the organization. This includes the administrative arrangements for (1) the "operating activities," (2) the "executive office," including the "general staff" or "management units" (such as planning, budgeting, and personnel) which serve the administrator in his work of over-all management and direction, and (3) the service or auxiliary activities such as language services, conference services, supply, accounting, communications, files, transportation, legal services, library, reproduction and distribution of documents, etc. In international agencies, many of these services play a more important rôle than in most organizations, since a primary function of secretariats is to arrange and provide services for conferences, committees, and other meetings.

The plan of organization must also provide for any overseas offices and for the arrangements at headquarters to control and service such offices. Another organizational problem is the method of gearing the administration of the agency into that of other international bodies. This is a major concern of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on whom

must devolve much of the responsibility for making a coördinated structure out of the constellation of agencies comprising the United Nations system.

A companion step to planning the organization is the preparation of the budget. The budget interprets the program and organization in terms of staff, material, and other requirements. Such requirements must be scheduled by purposes and time periods. Plans for financing the budget are a part of this step. During the financial year, the budget process furnishes an important means of control and coördination.

Next, the organization must be staffed with suitable personnel. Staffing is perhaps the most important element of administrative management, and one conducted far too haphazardly in international agencies. Positions must be carefully analyzed and defined and personnel recruited who possess the qualifications required for each position. Employees must be trained and reassigned in accord with demonstrated abilities and needs of the service. Other features of modern personnel management also come into play just as in national or private agencies.

Within the organizational framework, operating procedures, auxiliary services, and administrative controls common to the whole organization, must be designed and put in good working order. Failures in conference services in an international agency may cause serious delays and frictions in conference or committee negotiations.

At the same time, the administrator must arrange for experience data on policy, program, and methods to flow upward to the top of the organization, to be systematically analyzed, and for information concerning new or revised policies, doctrine, and procedure to be disseminated down through the organization. The establishment of work standards, administrative reporting systems, internal and external statistical and other intelligence services, and inspection of work are all necessary to an effective organization.

Establishment of the elements of management leads to the heart of day-to-day administration. Here we see the administrator, aided by his principal operating and management assistants, providing continuous leadership and direction to the organization. As conditions change, he must set new objectives and refinements in programs; direct operations through the budget, reporting, and control processes mentioned above; and coördinate the various segments of the organization in the light of information flowing upward or secured in personal negotiations. He must motivate the organization and effect changes in personnel, organization, and procedure to keep abreast of new programs and improved methods.

A final element in this process of management is the maintenance of the effective external relationships. This is more difficult in international agencies than in national governments, and far more complicated than in

private business. The international administrator is judged by the public within each member-country, as well as by the representative organs to which he is accountable. He must cope with diverse cultures, political aspirations, administrative doctrines, and professional jealousies. Not only the administrator, but his whole staff as well, must develop effective personal contacts with representatives and citizens of governments, with policy organs, the press, radio, the motion picture interests, and with other public and private international organizations. It will be necessary also to plan and conduct a world-wide information program to sell and explain the organization's program as widely as possible.

Administrative and Program Planning. The speed and effectiveness with which the United Nations and the specialized agencies have been established have depended in large measure on the quality of the initial planning of program, organization, and method of operation. Some of the agencies have done relatively well, others not so well. The importance of administrative planning during the early stages of an international organization should be obvious. However, the architects and administrators of some organizations have tended to see only their goals and to be conscious only of the vital need for a particular type of international program and action. Consequently, they often rush into their work without considering the means for execution. They fail to understand the need for continuing analysis of the agency's program and of the organization and management devices by which program review is carried out.

The concept of administrative and program planning, as a general staff function, however, is well established in the U.N. The need for such planning was first emphasized in the report of the Preparatory Commission and in General Assembly resolutions, and since then a considerable amount of planning work has been carried on.

While planning work is necessarily conducted in a number of different places and levels in the U.N. Secretariat and in the representative organs and committees, one unit, the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget, serves the Secretary-General full time in such work. This Bureau, in consultation with the operating departments, formulates the work program in the light of policies established by the representative organs and prepares the budget. It assists the Secretary-General in the presentation of the budget and in assuring the execution of the program adopted. The major part of its work, integrally related with program development and control, is the development of the internal organizational arrangements of the Secretariat and assistance in devising and installing the various administrative methods and processes. Here we see programming, budgeting, and administrative planning merged to form an effective instrument of management. Unfortunately, many of the specialized agencies have lagged behind the U.N. in the establishment of modern planning and managerial facilities of this type.

The Budget as a Plan. The need for staff facilities for budgetary and administrative planning in the U.N. is generally accepted, but the use of the budget as an executive planning and coördinating device is not fully understood. As is still the case with many national administrators, international executives sometimes regard the annual budget as an unpleasant task necessary to secure funds from the appropriating body, or as a mathematical exercise to be performed by accountants.

The budget through which the chief administrator presents to member nations his concept of the organization's objectives and work program for the ensuing year is an essential step not only in planning but also in establishing the responsibilities and position of the chief executive. In order to present such a budget, the executive must assess the priorities among the many tasks which confront the organization, he must balance and integrate the program in relation to long-time objectives, and he must reconcile internal differences to reach agreement with his staff on the total program.

Up to the present, international organizations have not prepared their budgets in program terms, although they reflect programs. Estimates have been developed in nearly every agency by objects of expenditure for the agency as a whole—personnel, supplies, etc.—and by costs of meetings and conferences. One program item—public welfare services—is included in the U.N. budget for 1947.

Organization. Flexibility in the organizational structure of the international agencies is essential during the formative stages. The tendency to compartmentalize, freeze, and create vested interests in a structure is perhaps stronger on the international level than anywhere else. Representatives of some governments become wedded to traditional plans and techniques. National groups in the secretariat sometimes consciously or unconsciously move to create "pockets" and establish their own particular ideas. Commissions and committees to investigate and report, each in its own functional sphere, tend to demand special administrative consideration. The debates in the United Nations on organization according to functions versus a structure by representative organs are illustrative.

In all international agencies, the question arises as to whether the operating structure should be organized according to subject-matter, function, process, professional fields of personnel required, clientele, geography, or other factors. The organizational analyst in national and private management would be at home here. He must recognize, however, the unusual need for flexibility until a staff morale, a special international spirit, and a strengthened executive can aid in fusing into an operating whole the various ideas of structure.

Of all the organizational issues, the most controversial in international agencies is the arrangement for the "general staff" and common services. The case of the United Nations is in point. The way in which these func-

tions were finally organized differed considerably from the first recommendations of the executive committee of the Preparatory Commission. Many delegates pressed for the establishment of an independent treasury department. Since most of the political representatives were unfamiliar with the "general staff" concept, it was difficult to develop the idea of how such a staff would serve the Secretary-General, and therefore occupy a position in the organization different from that of the operating departments. The compromise solution was to establish the administrative management and budget bureau, personnel bureau, and comptroller's bureau under one assistant secretary-general and to place all conference and general services under another.

Personnel. Of all the problems facing the international administrator, that of staffing the organization and handling its personnel matters is most frequently cited as the one which differentiates management on the international level from national and industrial levels of administration. Two facets of personnel management on the international level give rise to many problems—the need for a competent staff with a supra-national loyalty, and the practical necessity for recruitment of staff on a wide geographical basis. The international administrator, while facing these particular problems, must give more attention than any other administrator to the human factor in his administration; for his staff is less homogeneous.

No matter how sound the organization plan may be, the secretariat will fail to meet its responsibility unless the key officials are persons of outstanding competence, integrity, and good will, who will attract others of equal caliber into the lower ranks. The need for good top leadership is especially important because of the difficulties of fitting together into a working team persons who come from widely diverse political, cultural, and language backgrounds. Here we see familiar management problems placed in new contexts.

Position classification or job analysis work in the U.N. agencies is complicated by the geographical distribution problem and the difficulty of fitting persons with diverse backgrounds and national sensitivities into a fixed hierarchy. Thus the classification plan must be planned in broad terms with special efforts made to fit personnel into posts for which they are found most suited. The establishment of salary scales and other emoluments calls for expert study and judgment. Salaries must be related both to prevailing rates in the headquarters area and to practices in diverse national settings. Various allowances are required to meet the special conditions of expatriation and of installation in a new environment. Adequate retirement and disability arrangements, leave, and other conditions of service must be established on a systematic basis.

The U.N. and some of the specialized agencies recognize these aspects of modern personnel management, and in several instances are establishing

adequate personnel offices. A major problem will be to get the operating officials to recognize their rôle in personnel administration and to carry out their part of the job in a progressive and effective manner.

V. DEVELOPING A SUITABLE BODY OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL OFFICIALS

We must develop rapidly a large and widely distributed body of competent administrators and management advisors if suitable progress is to be made on all the three fronts required for effective international collaboration. Able persons of this type are essential in developing a better structure for international negotiation, particularly as we look toward world government on an increasing scale. They are necessary in the establishment of well-administered secretariats. And the participation of national governments on a satisfactory basis in international agencies calls for a higher quality of national administration.

International agencies and national bodies should take aggressive steps to train administrative persons and to develop opportunities for exchange of staff. Many possibilities exist within individual international agencies for the training and development of able administrators. By linking the personnel programs of the U.N. and the specialized agencies, transfers or loans of staff between these agencies would be facilitated.

On the other hand, the United Nations has already resolved that "officials from national service should be enabled to spend a short period . . . in the Secretariat so that personal contacts between the Secretariat and national administrators may be strengthened and a body of national officials with international experience created." This is a desirable step. Of even greater importance, however, is a wide-scale exchange of administrative officials between nations. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is considering a program to further the interchange of knowledge, skills, and personnel in the field of governmental administration, and to perform such other clearing-house activities as would give each country the latest information on the organization and management of public enterprises. Not only would governments gain in efficiency, but mutual understanding among officials would be greatly furthered.

Few groups are more important than the administrators of government programs in developing sound attitudes between nations and between different interests in each country. Anything that can be done to produce friendly understanding on the part of this group represents a vital step forward in the establishment of a good climate for international coöperation.

The exchange of persons, ideas, and experiences across national borders between public officials and others interested in management is for the

most part still rudimentary. The beginnings that have been made, however, have been carried on at small expense, and they have been arranged and administered with ease. The programs are yielding results far in excess of their costs measured in terms of the establishment of more effective agencies of government, the development of a systematic approach to administrative reform, more effective management methods, and a new understanding of the problems of international collaboration. International agencies are now benefiting from staff whose abilities have been developed through such exchange.

Finally, anyone concerned with the development of qualified management personnel with broader vision for both national and international administration can see a challenge to the colleges and universities. Stated simply, the closer integration of the world demands the training of more management personnel with a background of study in international affairs and, conversely, the training of more international affairs specialists to appreciate and comprehend the essentials of good management.

The need for a greater understanding of the application of scientific management principles to international organizations, and for the development of a body of trained international administrators who can apply these principles, constitutes a major problem of this contracting world.

POST-WAR POLITICS IN JAPAN, I*

I. THE JAPANESE DIET UNDER THE NEW CONSTITUTION**

JUSTIN WILLIAMS

Chief, Legislative Division, Government Section, SCAP

From the standpoint of the national legislature, the constitution of Japan which became effective on May 3, 1947, contains the following significant reforms: (1) popular sovereignty replaces the sovereignty of the emperor; (2) the Diet is the chief branch of government; (3) an elected House of Councillors supersedes the House of Peers; (4) the cabinet is responsible to the Diet; (5) the "invisible government" of crown agencies is abolished.

The preamble to the new constitution begins: "We, the Japanese people, acting through our duly elected representatives in the National Diet . . . , do proclaim that sovereign power resides with the people." As for the once sacred and inviolable emperor, he does "not have powers related to government,"[1] but functions merely as "the symbol of the state and of the unity of the people, deriving his position from the will of the people with whom resides sovereign power,"[2] performing, "with the advice and approval of the cabinet," only such acts as promulgating laws, convoking the Diet and dissolving the House of Representatives, proclaiming general elections, attesting the appointment of officials, and awarding honors.[3]

Pursuant to the principle of popular sovereignty, the Diet ranks first among the branches of government. Consisting of the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors, the members of which are elected by and representative of all the people, the Diet "shall be the highest organ of state power, and shall be the sole law-making organ."[4] Executive power is invested in a cabinet "collectively responsible to the Diet"[5] and headed by a prime minister "designated from among the

* Planned and arranged by Harold S. Quigley, University of Minnesota. Lack of space has unfortunately made it necessary to divide this group of articles between the October and December issues. The contributions to be published in December are: Harry E. Wildes, "Underground Politics in Postwar Japan," and Justin Williams, "Party Politics in the New Japanese Diet." *Man. Ed.*

** Nothing contained in this article is to be construed as in any sense official.

[1] Constitution of Japan, Art. 4. For an appraisal of the old and new constitutions, see H. S. Quigley, "Japan's Constitutions: 1890 and 1947," in this REVIEW, Vol. 41, pp. 865–874 (Oct., 1947).

[2] Art. 1. [3] Art. 7.

[4] Art. 41. Membership in the House of Representatives remains at 466; of the 250 Councillors, 100 are elected at large and 150 on a prefectural basis. The defunct House of Peers had 407 members in 1946.

[5] Art. 66.

members of the Diet by a resolution of the Diet."[6] The crippling financial limitations imposed upon the Diet by the Meiji constitution have been removed and the principle established that the nation's finances are administered "as the Diet shall determine."[7] No money can be expended, nor can the state obligate itself, unless so authorized by the Diet.[8] The cabinet prepares budgets and submits them to the Diet for consideration and final decision.[9] The Diet at its discretion may authorize a reserve fund for the use of the cabinet, but expenditures must subsequently be approved by the Diet.[10] Exclusively vested in the Diet is the power to levy new taxes or to modify existing taxes.[11] All imperial household property has become the property of the state, and expenses for the imperial household are appropriated annually in the budget.[12] Absolute control by the Diet of every aspect of national policy is limited only by the power of the Supreme Court "to determine the constitutionality of any law, order, regulation, or official act."[13] The successor to the old *gikai* has assumed the policy-making powers once exercised by the cabinet, privy council, military boards, elder statesmen, imperial household ministry, senior statesmen, and the imperial conference. The cabinet may issue cabinet orders, not, however, as imperial ordinances were formerly issued, but only for the purpose of executing the provisions of the constitution and of laws enacted by the Diet.[14] The method of amending the constitution has been simplified, requiring only a two-thirds vote of each house and subsequent ratification by a majority of the voters.[15]

Passage of the Diet Law. The Diet Law, superseding Ito's Law of the Houses, received the "consent of the Imperial Diet" on March 19, 1947, and on April 28 was promulgated by the emperor, countersigned by all cabinet ministers, and approved by the privy council—in accordance with Articles 6, 55, and 56 respectively of the Meiji constitution. The usual order of promulgation reads: "I hereby give my sanction, with the approval of the Privy Councillors, to the Diet Law for which the concurrence of the Imperial Diet has been obtained, and cause the same to be promulgated."[16]

The Diet Law alone, of all the laws supplementing the new constitution, was drafted and introduced, not by the Government, in accordance with time-honored procedure, but by the House of Representatives, without the approval of the cabinet or the collaboration of the House of Peers. In all particulars, it was a piece of legislation initiated by and expressing the will of the only agency in the national government (before May 3, 1947)

[6] Art. 67. A majority of the cabinet must be Diet members. Art. 68. The first cabinet under the new constitution was composed of 16 Representatives, including the prime minister, and one Councillor.

[7] Art. 83. [8] Art. 85. [9] Art. 86. [10] Art. 87. [11] Art. 84.
[12] Art. 88. [13] Art. 81. [14] Art. 73. [15] Art. 96.
[16] *Official Gazette*, Apr. 30, 1947.

representing the people. Accurately stated, the emperor, the cabinet, the privy council, and the House of Peers gave their consent to a law originating in the House of Representatives.

Employing the Oriental metaphor of power, Bando Kotaro, veteran Representative who assisted in drafting the Diet Law bill, declared: "If we assume that the new constitution is a dragon, we can say that the Diet Law is its eyes."[17] The genesis of this democratically drafted measure was explained to the House of Representatives Special Committee on the Diet Law bill by Chief Clerk Oike Makoto as follows:[18]

"With the establishment of the new constitution, the supplementary law known as the Diet Law was to be enacted for governing the procedures of the National Diet. This task placed a heavy responsibility on the House itself for formulating a democratic law. On the one hand, the Government appointed the Special Provisional Legislative Investigation Committee to revise the Law of the Houses, and on the other hand, the House of Representatives commissioned twenty of its members, representing all parties, to do the same work. The first meeting of the House group was held on July 6, 1946. Throughout the remainder of the harried Diet session, the members carried on vigorous debates and drafted a Diet Law bill consisting of 19 chapters. On the basis of this draft, codification of the bill was taken up in earnest following the close of the Diet session on October 12. Each member freely expressed his opinions and deliberated upon all articles with great seriousness. At ten or more of these meetings, to which numerous government experts were invited, discussions were carried on in a spirit of harmony, with the result that this final draft received the approval of all twenty members of the House committee. Government Section of GHQ rendered every assistance throughout this period, supplying us with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as passed by the United States Congress, encouraging the committee to frame a genuinely democratic Diet Law, and offering suggestions on numerous occasions for increasing the authority of the National Diet, for which the entire membership of this committee is most grateful."

At the conclusion of two days of vigorous debate, December 19-20, the bill was unanimously approved in committee. Coöperative Democrat Uda Kuniei said: "Following the spirit of the history-making constitution, we

[17] House of Representatives, 91st Session, Special Committee on the Diet Law Bill, *Proceedings*, No. 1, Dec. 19, 1946. The bill was drafted and proposed by 21 members, including the speaker and vice-speaker. Upon introduction, it was referred to a special committee of 36 members, six of whom had aided in framing it. Among the members who drafted the bill, together with their status at the installation of the Katayama cabinet in June, 1947, were Ashida Hitoshi, Democratic party president and minister of foreign affairs; Mizutani Chosaburo, Social Democrat, minister of commerce and industry; Ono Banboku, secretary-general of the Liberal party; Tanaka Manitsu, Democrat, vice-speaker of the House of Representatives; Tokuda Kyuichi, secretary-general of the Communist party; Matsumoto Takizo, People's Coöperative, parliamentary vice-minister of foreign affairs; Satake Haruki, Social Democrat, parliamentary vice-minister of justice; Bando Kotaro, Democrat, chairman of the Standing Committee on Local Government; Inoue Tomoharu. Democrat (former vice-speaker); and Yamazaki Takeshi, Liberal (former speaker). The last-named, a member of the lower house for over 25 years, encouraged the Investigation Committee to break new ground in writing the Diet Law.

[18] *Ibid.*

members of the House of Representatives have drafted this Diet Law bill. In studying the entire measure, clause by clause, we of the Coöperative Democratic party find it truly democratic and, in addition, endowed with authority. Therefore, we heartily approve this proposal." Hosono Michio, speaking for the Social Democratic party, said: "I approve this bill. It contains some unsatisfactory points, but, after all, these have to do with operations. Since Diet members will carry out this law, let us correct any faults that may be found from its actual operation."

Similar comments were made by spokesmen for the Liberal, Democratic, People's, and Communist parties.[19] The House of Representatives passed the Diet Law bill without a dissenting vote on December 21, 1946, and immediately sent it to the House of Peers.[20]

Before the bill was referred to committee in the House of Peers, Sasaki Soichi, a member, was granted permission at the plenary session on December 22 to interpellate the Government. His first question and comment were:

"Why did not the Government itself draft and present this Diet Law bill? The Government should have drafted it as a matter of course, in accordance with the imperial constitution which is still in force. In cases of such importance as the Diet Law bill, it has been customary for the Government to take the initiative."[21]

State Minister Uehara Etsujiro replied:

"The argument is plausible that the Government should have introduced it. In fact, the Government had at first intended to draw up a bill following deliberations of the Cabinet Legislative Investigation Committee and submit it to the two Houses for approval, but, in the meantime, the Speaker of the House of Representatives reminded us that inasmuch as the Diet Law would govern the future operation of the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors, it behooved the House of Representatives to formulate the draft and introduce it in the Diet. The Government quite agreed with the Speaker on this point, for under the new constitution the Diet Law will be operated by the two Houses rather than by the Government, and it will be more in accord with the spirit of the new constitution to entrust the task to the first chamber."[22]

Mr. Sasaki's second point:

"I wonder if it is necessary to have the National Diet Law enacted during the extraordinary session, which will close in two or three days. The purpose for which the National Diet Law bill has been drafted is substantially different from that for which the Law of the Houses was drafted. For this reason, I think that the House of Peers, which has for a long time been acting in conformity with the Law of the Houses and which has fully clarified the purpose of the Law, will also have to de-

[19] *Ibid.*, No. 2, Dec. 20, 1946. Committee arguments centered mainly upon the secretary-general as a House official, introduction of a bill by a single member, public hearings, and qualified specialists for committees.

[20] *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 22, 1946, p. 6.

[21] *Ibid.*, Dec. 23, 1946, p. 2.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 3. Uehara, Liberal, graduate of the University of Washington and London University, previously served nine terms in the House of Representatives.

liberate upon the Diet Law bill as a new one substantially different from the old one. I think it very difficult for our House to finish the task in two or three days."[23]

Uehara answered:

"The House of Councillors bill passed by you is now before the House of Representatives and will most probably meet with its approval. The new constitution, as all of you know, will come into force on the 3rd of May next and the Government is anxious to see the House of Councillors in working order before that date. If the two Houses are to deliberate in conformity with the spirit of the new constitution, the present Law of the Houses will be found inadequate. It is therefore most desirable that before the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors coördinately enter upon deliberation of state affairs in the name of the Diet, the Diet Law be ready for enforcement. Though it makes a voluminous code, to those who have ripe experience like you in pushing through legislative business, and who are fully acquainted with the spirit of the new constitution and of the prospective Diet Law, it will be no great difficulty to dispose of the bill in two or three days."[24]

At this point, Uehara took occasion to voice a sharp protest against an unwarranted restriction placed upon the Diet by the Meiji constitution:

"The bill, as already alluded to, is a law project introduced by the other House. When a measure introduced by one of the two Houses is passed and sent up to the other, the latter is denied an opportunity under the current Law of the Houses to hear an explanatory statement by its authors in the former. This fact has made for a great deal of inconvenience and disadvantage to both Houses by hindering smooth progress of proceedings on the bill. This shortcoming has been rectified in the new constitution, but under the constitution in force today no remedy can be found for it. It is highly regrettable that this House will have to endure such inconvenience in reviewing so important a bill. To alleviate such inconvenience in a degree, the Government suggests that before formally opening committee meetings on the bill, this House may find it advisable to invite either its authors or the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the other House that they might give you comments or answers to questions about the spirit underlying the bill, the object of each article, and the viewpoint of the lower House as a whole."[25]

Three days later, on the final day of the 91st Diet Session, the Peers committee killed the Diet Law bill by refusing to report it out, justifying its action by the limited time allowed for deliberation.[26]

Without debate, the House of Representatives on February 21, 1947, again introduced and unanimously passed the original Diet Law bill[27] and sent it to the House of Peers, where it was approved with a dozen or more minor amendments on March 18. Hashimoto Jitsuhi, chairman of the House of Peers committee, said in his report to the House: "The length of time devoted to the study of this bill is almost unprecedented." Otherwise his report revealed that the Peers' coolness toward the bill and its framers

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4. [24] *Ibid.*, [25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Yomiuri Shimbun*, Dec. 26, 1946. The Peers also resented Uehara's ungracious manner, the fact that the Representatives sponsored the bill, and the refusal of the latter to agree to amend Article 84 permitting the Councillors as well as the Representatives to request a joint committee. *Ibid.*

[27] *Official Gazette*, extra, Feb. 22, 1947, p. 2.

had not changed since the previous December.[28] Next day, the House of Representatives accepted the amendments and thereby gave Diet "consent" to the Diet Law.[29]

Diet Law Provisions. The Diet Law contains 132 articles, of which 48 were taken verbatim from the imperial Law of the Houses, two from the Meiji constitution, and four from the old Regulations of the House of Representatives. Since these articles concern members' qualifications, resignations and leaves, police protection, and other routine matters common to all legislative assemblies, no further mention need be made of them. Of the remaining 78 articles, 41 were also extracted from the Law of the Houses and the Meiji constitution, but radically altered or completely reversed in meaning, leaving a total of 37 original articles.

A number of antiquated and odious practices and procedures formerly imposed upon the Diet are omitted from the Diet Law. Most important omissions are the following: (1) division of the Houses into sections; (2) committee of the whole house; (3) three readings of a bill; (4) prorogation of the Houses; (5) requirement that subjects and schedules of Diet committees be reported in advance to the Government; (6) addresses to the throne and representations to the Government; (7) restrictions on petitions; (8) remarks by Diet members implying disrespect for the imperial house. The word "emperor" appears nowhere in the Diet Law, while the expressions "imperial rescript"[30] and "throne" are used only in connection with convocations, promulgation of laws,[31] and nomination of the prime minister.[32]

The 41 radically changed provisions of the Law of the Houses and the Meiji constitution incorporated in the Diet Law have as their primary aims removal of all restrictions on and increase in the dignity and prestige of the Diet and recognition of the primacy of the House of Representatives.

The name of the national legislature is changed from "Imperial Diet" (*teikoku gikai*) to "National Diet" (*kokkai*). By setting convocation of the ordinary session within the first ten days of December,[33] the Diet Law eliminates the former custom of opening the Diet in late December immediately prior to the traditional month-long New Year holiday, which in effect reduced the term of the session from three to two months. Since the Japanese fiscal year ends on March 31, the new convocation date allows budget committees a maximum of about three months, exclusive of the New Year holiday, for examining the annual budget. Henceforth, the speaker of the House of Representatives, rather than the president of the House of Peers, will preside over the joint assembly of the Houses at the

[28] *Ibid.*, Mar. 19, 1947, pp. 21–24. [29] *Ibid.*, Mar. 20, 1947, p. 2.
[30] Diet Law, Arts. 1, 5. [31] Arts. 65, 66. [32] Art. 65. [33] Art. 2.

opening ceremony,[34] to which the emperor will be invited, although the Diet Law is silent on the subject. The latter point is unimportant inasmuch as convocation, not the opening ceremony, as in the past, authorizes the Diet to function.[35] The term of the ordinary session is increased from three to five months,[36] while the term of a special session is fixed by the Houses.[37] The extension of a session is no longer determined by imperial order, but by decision of the Houses, the wishes of the House of Representatives prevailing in case of disagreement.[38] Chairmen and vice-chairmen, as well as secretaries-general, are now elected by members of the respective Houses, thus completely eliminating the former prerogatives of the emperor and cabinet to appoint them.[39]

Under the new dispensation, "Expenditures of each House shall be appropriated independently in the national budget . . . and shall include a contingent fund."[40] This release from the stranglehold of the finance ministry was the occasion for rejoicing among members of both Houses. During committee deliberations on the Diet Law bill in the House of Peers, Okochi Kiko asked: "What is meant by 'expenditures of the Houses shall be appropriated independently in the national budget'?" He then commented:

"Reductions of Diet expenditures by the finance ministry in the past were unreasonable . . . . The Diet and persons connected with the Diet should be treated like human beings . . . . Heretofore the government desired to have members loaf on the job as much as possible so as to prevent them from being active in the affairs of the Houses. It was a common practice to have no lights at night . . . . Even if the House of Peers Journal did get to our hands, it was a lot of bother and was just as good undelivered . . . . If we did not appear for work there were no objections raised . . . . If the Diet members fail now to receive treatment due to human beings, there will be no chance for democratic government."[41]

State Minister Uehara advised Okochi to put his mind at ease:

"Once the constitution is enforced," he said, "there will be no need to worry about these points . . . . If part of the budget is appropriated by the finance ministry as at present, the Diet cannot function freely. If past conditions should prevail, permitting the budget to be modified by the bureau of accounting of the finance ministry, the Diet, which is to be the central organ, would lose its power to conduct the affairs of the government . . . . The Diet must have the right to establish its own budget . . . . An independent budget for the legislature of the nation has great significance . . . . For the first time, we have reached a point where good democratic government is possible."[42]

Instead of the low salaries grudgingly paid in the past by a paternalistic government, members now receive an annual stipend "not less in amount

[34] Art. 9. [35] Arts. 8, 14. [36] Art. 10. [37] Art. 11.
[38] Arts. 12, 13. [39] Art. 16. [40] Art. 32.
[41] House of Peers, 91st Session, Special Committee on the Diet Law Bill, *Proceedings*, No. 2, Dec. 23, 1946. [42] *Ibid.*

than the highest pay for government officials in general,"[43] that is, not less than vice-ministers. Moreover, a retirement allowance is provided for members at the end of their Diet service,[44] permitting them, as one member said, to "concentrate on state business and lead the people, free from the anxieties of family affairs."[45]

The Houses are no longer shackled by the Government. The cabinet cannot withdraw or amend a Government bill already on the agenda of either House without the consent of the House concerned.[46] It cannot compel the Houses to hold closed sessions. Bills to be promulgated are now reported to the throne through the cabinet by the speaker of the House of Representatives, who also communicates to the throne the nomination of the prime minister.[47] Although the constitution authorizes a minister of state to speak at any time in either House,[48] the Diet Law requires him before doing so to notify the House chairman.[49] The cabinet is required to report to the Houses annually on the disposition of petitions submitted to it.[50] The Government cannot deny the request of either House for documents and reports, even secret ones, and "the cabinet and the ministries must send copies of their publications to the Diet library" and to Diet members when deemed necessary by the Diet library management standing committees.[51]

In other major respects, this law frees the Diet from government domination. Explaining the Diet Law bill upon its introduction in the House of Representatives on December 18, 1946, Tanaka Manitsu said: "None of the regulations found everywhere in the imperial Law of the Houses giving priority to the Government has been retained; those regulations have been completely eliminated."[52] The government practice of appointing Diet members to government positions is modified by the stipulation that such appointments must be provided for by law.[53] Designed to permit reconsideration by the Diet of the system of parliamentary vice-ministers, councillors, and secretaries, inaugurated in 1924 by the cabinet for the purpose of controlling key Diet members by naming them to government posts, this proviso could not be fully implemented until Article X of the Law of Election, which authorized these appointments, was amended.[54] The government practice of selecting bureaucrats, sometimes as many as 180 for a single session, to represent the various ministries in Diet plenary

[43] Diet Law, Art. 35. [44] Art. 36.

[45] Speech of Tanaka Manitsu explaining the Diet Law bill in the House of Representatives, *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946. pp. 1–5.

[46] Diet Law, Art. 59. [47] Art. 65. [48] Constitution, Art. 63.

[49] Diet Law, Art. 70. [50] Art. 81. [51] Arts. 104, 105.

[52] *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946, p. 2. [53] Diet Law, Art. 39.

[54] First included in the Election Law of 1925, Art. X remained intact, unnoticed by most Diet members, when that law was revised in Mar., 1947, a few days after the enactment of the Diet Law. It was repealed on Apr. 7, 1948.

sessions and committee meetings is now checked by the requirement that such government delegates must first be approved by the presiding officers of the Houses.[55] Diet committees can now request the presence of Board of Audit officials at their meetings, a practice denied them by the Meiji constitution.[56]

Innovations in the Diet Law. Having eliminated or altered those articles of the Law of the Houses which degraded the Diet and subjected its members to preposterous discourtesies and insults by government officials, the framers of the Diet Law equipped the Diet with a number of new aids, devices, and facilities essential to a modern legislative body. Members for the first time receive allowances "for posting documents and communications of an official character."[57] A novel idea in Japan, the franking privilege was heretofore reserved to government officials. Also calculated to increase both the prestige and efficiency of Diet members is the provision for furnishing each member an office and one clerical assistant at state expense.[58] In the past, members had only such office space and clerical help as their respective political parties could afford. The Diet library and the bill-drafting and reference service called for by the Diet Law will fulfill a need, explained Tanaka, which has "hitherto been repeatedly emphasized by our predecessors."[59]

Replacing the committee of the whole house, never used during 57 years of the Diet under the Meiji constitution, is the system of "free discussion" under which each House must meet at least once every two weeks during Diet sessions to discuss state policy or other matters. The presiding officer sets a time limit on speeches; a subject under discussion, upon motion of a member, may be put to a vote of the House.[60]

> "It is by no means an exaggeration to say," declared Tanaka Manitsu, "that under the existing law we members of the Diet have had practically no chance to express our views unless we participated as members of the budget committee. It is indeed a matter for profound regret that the Diet has fallen short of its name as the 'seat of public opinion.' However, by the system of free discussion, it is expected that this weakness of the Diet will be greatly rectified. Members will be enabled freely to express their views and opinions on whatever problems they desire to take up. They may be questions to the cabinet or expressions of views either of the speakers or the party to which they belong. By this system, questions deviating from the problem under discussion as practiced now in the budget committee meetings will no longer be necessary, enabling this committee to revert to its proper function."[61]

The best features of the interpellation system have been retained and liberalized. With just cause, any member may, upon approval of the

[55] *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946, p. 4.

[56] Diet Law, Art. 72; Meiji constitution, Art. LXXII. The government submitted Board of Audit reports to the Diet.

[57] Diet Law, Art. 38. [58] Art. 132.

[59] Art. 130; *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946, p. 5.

[60] Diet Law, Art. 78. [61] *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946, p. 4.

House chairman, question a cabinet minister or his delegate; should the chairman object, the member may appeal to the House. If the House turns down the request, the purport of the member's interpellation must nevertheless be entered in the record. A cabinet minister may, as he ordinarily did in the past, make a brief and meaningless reply to a member's interpellation, but only at the risk of having his answer debated and put to a vote of the House upon motion of a member.[62]

The method of handling bills has been changed. Any member, as well as the Government (whose bills no longer take precedence over member bills), introduces a piece of legislation by simply handing it to the House chairman, who refers it directly to the appropriate standing committee.[63] It was customary in the past for the introducer of a bill—almost always the Government—to explain it in plenary session at the time of its introduction, after which various members delivered set speeches or harangues, concluding them with one or more questions directed at the introducer. This was called interpellation, the main purpose of which was to embarrass the Government. There is no rule now against having bills thus treated, but the practice will not be used unless the House specifically requests it in connection with a particular bill. Instead, "urgent" interpellations may be made as occasion arises.[64] Excepting those transmitted from the other House, bills die if the committee to which the House chairman refers them decides not to report them out, providing, however, that within seven days of the committee's announced decision 20 or more members may demand that a bill be brought to the floor of the House.[65] In order to discourage the offering of numerous unimportant amendments, a motion to amend a bill reported out of committee must be supported by 20 members.[66] If a member bill is passed by one House, the author may explain the bill in the other House upon its introduction there,[67] a right previously reserved to the Government. For speeding up the legislative process, a Government bill introduced in one House must within five days be submitted to the other House for preliminary examination.[68]

[62] Diet Law, Art. 77.

[63] Art. 56. "Mr. Yamaguchi Kikuichiro: 'I wish to make an urgent motion for a change in the Order of the Day. That is, I move that the fifth item . . . be taken up now and its deliberation be proceeded with.' The Speaker: 'Is there any objection . . . ?' 'No objection!' is voiced. The Speaker: ' . . . The Government has agreed to this change . . . . And so the Order of the Day is changed accordingly. We will hold the First Reading of the fifth item . . . the bill for the Diet Law'." *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946, p. 1. The first four "items" were Government bills!

[64] Diet Law, Art. 76.

[65] Art. 56. In the United States House of Representatives, a majority (218) of the total membership must make a similar demand in order to force a bill out of committee.

[66] Art. 57. [67] Art. 60. [68] Art. 58.

The most significant part of the Diet Law, the chapter dealing with standing committees, parallels in several important respects the United States Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.[69] The system of standing committees more than anything else differentiates the Japanese House of Representatives from the British House of Commons and gives the Diet a strong resemblance to the United States Congress. Whether the Diet becomes "the highest organ of state power and the sole lawmaking body" or continues to pursue its historic rôle as a mere discussion group will depend, in the last analysis, upon the degree to which the standing committees use the powers conferred upon them and the skill with which they employ the new legislative aids and devices. Twenty-one standing committees are set up in either House, one for each major field of jurisdiction, such as foreign affairs, budgets, audit, commerce, transportation, education and labor, plus steering, library, and disciplinary committees.[70] Each member of the Diet must be appointed to at least one of these committees, but to no more than three, and once appointed he may serve throughout his term, six years in the House of Councillors and a maximum of four years in the House of Representatives.[71] Standing committee chairmen are elected by the Houses;[72] special committees elect their own chairmen.[73] Membership in both standing and special committees "shall be allotted in proportion to the numerical strength of political parties or groups in the respective Houses."[74] Whereas under the Law of the Houses the rule against outsiders attending committee meetings was approved and rigorously adhered to by a majority of Diet members, hearings are now open to the public except when a committee votes to hold a secret meeting.[75] In the past, a minority report was not permitted unless at least one-third of the members of the committee disagreed with the majority position, but now any member is privileged to make a minority report.[76] In view of the bitter fight waged by the House of Representatives in the 1930's to establish a permanent lower house committee, only to be defeated by the House of Peers, it is interesting to note that the Diet Law allows standing and special committees to "examine matters entrusted to them only during the term of a session," but at the discretion of the respective Houses one or even all committees may be authorized to conduct investigations between sessions,[77] thus making it possible, after all, said Tanaka, "to achieve the objective . . . which has been maintained by the House of Representatives for years."[78]

In addition to the aids mentioned above, "each standing committee shall be provided at least two qualified specialists who are not Diet members, and an adequate number of secretarial assistants, all of whom

[69] Pub. Law 601, 79th Cong., enacted Aug. 2, 1946. [70] Diet Law, Art. 42.
[71] Art. 41. [72] Art. 25. [73] Art. 45. [74] Art. 46. [75] Art. 52.
[76] Art. 54. [77] Art. 47. [78] *Official Gazette*, extra, Dec. 19, 1946, p. 3.

shall . . . receive adequate remuneration and shall not be otherwise employed. They cannot occupy any post in the administrative branches of the government for two years following their resignation from a standing committee."[79] Inherent in this plan is the development of a Diet bureaucracy, but to the extent that it provides technicians, working for and not against the legislative branch, who can match and offset government officials, it will be an advantage to the inexperienced Diet membership.

Popular participation in the lawmaking process is permitted by empowering committees to "conduct open hearings on important questions of popular concern or public interest in order to hear the views of interested parties and persons of learning and experience."[80] Two or three members of the special committee on the Diet Law bill entertained grave doubts about this new device. Public hearings, one of them protested, "in a way may seem to be a progressive rule, but I am absolutely against having experienced scholars or interested persons attend our meetings, especially when the subject concerns bills for budgets or incomes. It is fine for us to have party members attend and give us their opinions on certain subjects . . . "[81]

Another member of the committee agreed that while "it is only natural for each Diet member to try to gain all kinds of knowledge in every possible way . . . there is a great difference between a Diet member acting on his own and the entire House of Representatives setting up a public hearing system . . . I think that this is very radical in the sense that the general public is able to participate in legislation."[82]

No member objected to the provision authorizing each House to "dispatch its members for purposes of examination and investigation,"[83] a strange, new power which will aid the Diet in formulating and supervising state policy. With the power also to "summon witnesses to testify in connection with legislative matters and the investigation of national affairs,"[84] standing committee members can ultimately become as expert in their respective fields as government officials.

The Diet Law creates an agency called the Legislative Committee of the Houses, composed of 10 Representatives and 8 Councillors, whose func-

[79] Diet Law, Art. 43.

[80] Art. 51.

[81] Asanuma Inejiro, Social Democrat, House of Representatives, 91st Session, *Proceedings*, No. 1, Special Committee on the Diet Law Bill, Dec. 19, 1946.

[82] Kimura Kohei, Liberal, *ibid.*, No. 2, Dec. 20, 1946. This subject "was the most discussed provision" during the drafting of the Diet Law bill. Chief Clerk Oike, *ibid.*

[83] Diet Law, Art. 103.

[84] Art. 106.

tion is to "make recommendations to the Houses and the cabinet concerning the introduction of new legislation, existing laws, and cabinet orders; it shall also investigate and study the Diet Law and other regulations of the Houses and make recommendations to the Houses for their revision." With reference to interim sittings and permanency of membership, the regulations governing standing committees apply equally to the Legislative Committee of the Houses.[85] Should friction arise between the more powerful House of Representatives and the newly established House of Councillors, or between the Diet as the highest organ of state power and the cabinet elected by and responsible to the Diet, the Legislative Committee of the Houses, the only permanent joint committee in the Diet and the only committee capable of rising above the turmoil of party politics and factionalism, may advance an acceptable solution before serious damage is done. That the Committee has only advisory powers should give its decisions more weight than if it had compulsory powers, since reliance solely upon persuasive influence is not likely to engender Diet and cabinet antagonism based on jealousy. A committee of this nature has not been tried elsewhere on a national scale.

Conclusions. There is little resemblance between the old *gikai* and the new *kokkai.* The former was a discussion club characterized by impotency; the latter is the chief organ of government endowed with authority. Although the switch from one to the other will not be effectuated overnight, the transitional process will begin immediately and gain momentum rapidly; legislatures, like other agencies of government, are wont to exercise their powers to the utmost extent.

A number of factors will plague the new Diet and have a bearing upon its ultimate success. In addition to tackling the serious economic problems resulting from the war, Japan's freshman legislators who constitute a large majority in both Houses must wrestle with a blueprint of government which bristles with Western concepts and procedures. Will the untutored masses encourage and support their representatives in both these endeavors? Can the cesspools of corruption called political parties be cleaned up and forced to serve the national interest in preference to the narrow interests of the individual bosses? Will the still powerful bureaucracy continue, within the framework of the new order, to undermine the people's confidence in parliamentary government and to use Diet members as cat's paws? These matters, no less than broad constitutional powers and adequate legislative machinery, will determine the character of representative government in Japan.

[85] Arts. 99, 100, 101.

II. PRE-WAR POLITICAL INFLUENCES IN POST-WAR CONSERVATIVE PARTIES*

KENNETH E. COLTON
Research Analyst, GHQ, SCAP

In normal times and as to normal countries, the study of the continuity of political party life would be of interest mainly to the political scientist. But these are not normal times, and Japan today is not a normal country. In 1948, the subject holds far more than academic interest, and it is intimately affected by the supervision of Japanese administration by the Allied Powers.[1]

Allied policy affecting the continuity of political influence is shown in the famed "purge directive" of January 4, 1946, known as SCAPIN 550, "The Removal and Exclusion of Undesirable Personnel from Public Office." This article, however, is not concerned with that directive but with the character of the pre-war political influence that remains after the purge has cut out affected elements.[2] It is concerned with the element of pre-war political leadership present in the founding of the two major post-war conservative parties, the effect of the purge directive upon their leadership, their organizational and institutional character, the political influence of governmental bureaucracies, and the problem of party finance. Finally, attention is given to the possibility of a merger of the pre-war elements into one post-war organization.

The two conservative parties contending for political supremacy today are the Democratic-Liberal party (*Minshu Jiyu-to*), and the Democratic party (*Minshuto*), respectively the direct lineal descendants of the Liberal party (*Jiyuto*) and the Progressive party (*Shimpoto*), both of which were organized in November, 1945. Of the two parties today, the Democratic party's much milder conservatism places it closer to the political center than to its rival, the Democratic-Liberals, on the right. Both parties have their original roots in the pre-war *Seiyukai* (Friends of Politics Association) and the *Minseito* (People's Political party).

The Democratic-Liberal Inheritance. The Emperor's broadcast of the news of surrender had hardly died from the radio before veteran politicians began actively to revive a competitive political system. The first to

* Nothing contained in this article is to be construed as in any sense official.

[1] The Potsdam Proclamation of July 26, 1945, provides the basis for initial directives issued to occupation authorities regarding control of political forces. The basic initial post-surrender directive to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for the Occupation and Control of Japan, dated Nov. 1, 1945, is published in *Documents and State Papers*, United States Department of State, Vol. I, No. 1, Apr., 1948, pp. 32–45.

[2] For a brief analysis of the purge, see Harold S. Quigley, "The Great Purge in Japan," *Pacific Affairs*, Sept., 1947, pp. 299–308.

stir himself was Hatoyama Ichiro, whose father had been an early speaker of the House of Representatives, and who had held the posts of chief secretary in the Tanaka cabinet (1927–29), and minister of education in the Inukai and Saito cabinets of 1931–34.

As a leader of the Kuhara branch of the pre-war *Seiyukai*,[3] Hatoyama turned to his 30–35 followers in that group in his initial political moves. More especially, however, he sought the small core of personal followers, the constitutional parliamentarians, who had followed him into the *Doko Kai*, an anti-Tojo group in the Diet between November, 1941, and May, 1942.[4]

That Hatoyama's original plan was to rally all the anti-military, constitutionally liberal elements within one conservative party, and to cut across pre-war political party lines, was indicated by his bid to fellow *Doko Kai* associates formerly in the *Minseito* and *Shakai Taishuto*. This was seen also in the inclusion of notable non-party men and non-parliamentarians as advisers. When his non-*Seiyukai* associates in the *Doko Kai* lent their aid to a resurrection of their own pre-war political parties, the new movement became strictly Hatoyama *Seiyukai* in inheritance by default.[5]

[3] The *Seiyukai* finally split, after prolonged factional strife, in February, 1939, forming two large separately organized branches and one small group of neutrals. Nakajima Chikuhei, a retired naval officer and wealthy airplane manufacturer close to the industrialists exploiting the munitions program, led the largest group of 96. Kuhara Fusanosuke, wealthy mining entrepreneur, joined forces with Hatoyama's group of 30–35 followers to head 71 members. The neutrals numbered originally 11, and were composed of the ambitious who sought to offend neither faction. The Hatoyama group had by far the best and cleanest legislative record of the conservative groups between 1937 and 1943.

[4] The *Doko Kai* was dominated by 18 Hatoyama *Seiyukai* members; 11 members were *Minseito*, 4 *Shakai Taishuto* (Social Mass party) men, one was an independent, and three were without clear affiliation. It was dissolved in May, 1942, when the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society was formed. (Diet Secretariat Records Office.)

[5] *Minseito* veterans Kawasaki Katsu and Saito Takao had provisionally agreed to join the Hatoyama party in Sept., 1945, but withdrew when the Ugaki move was launched. Saito was important as a "post-card name" to the Progressives, desperate for something to give the party a specious air of liberalism. Ozaki Yukio lent his name originally to the party as an adviser, but his long-standing anti-party position blocked any active affiliation. Professor Minobe Tatsukichi, noted for his organic theory of the state, was also an adviser. Socialist Katayama Tetsu was the only founder of the Social Democratic party who was a member of the *Doko Kai;* however, Hatoyama had had associations with other Social Democrats in the 1943 fight against the Tojo strengthening of the peace preservation laws. It appears probable that, while no agreement to join the Liberal party was ever given, an understanding may have been reached, after the purge directive, to coöperate against the Progressives in the next government. This is broadly hinted at by Nishio Suehiro in an unreported speech to the Social Democratic convention on Jan. 16, 1946, and was confirmed by statements of Liberal party leaders to this writer.

When the Japan Liberal party was launched on November 9, 1945, however, 7 former *Minseito* members were among its listed Diet membership. It contained but one from the rival Nakajima branch of the old *Seiyukai*. The important posts in the party were held in every instance by a *Seiyukai* member close to Hatoyama. The none too popular Kono Ichiro, of the *Seiyukai* but not of the inner Hatoyama circle, was given the important post of chief secretary, largely because of his skill in raising party funds.[6] When the second post-war Diet opened on November 26, the Liberal party boasted 46 Diet members and second place among political parties.

The Liberal party has too often been judged by its name rather than by the origins of its label.[7] Actually, it reflected Hatoyama's staunch parliamentary support of the Meiji constitution and his distinctly nineteenth-century position on economic and social problems, which might be described as Gladstonian liberalism. Moreover, the new party quickly revealed the continued ambiguity of the pre-war Hatoyama faction of the *Seiyukai:* its support of parliamentary government, and its close affinity for the machine, and not infrequently the seamier, side of politics.[8]

Because the parliamentarians among the group were not the most successful party organizers, such *Seiyukai* partisans as Kono Ichiro and Matsuno Tsuruhei, the latter with extensive election network experience, came into growing influence, a development which notably cooled the ardor of other would-be supporters.[9]

Not alone in its composition, but in its general policies, the Liberal party quickly reflected the pre-war *Seiyukai* inheritance. The party's 1945 platform strongly supported the Tenno (emperor) system—the sensitive issue of 1945—advocated the popular election of governors, and plumped for free trade. Both Hatoyama and Yoshida Shigeru, former ambassador to Great Britain, foreign minister in the Shidehara cabinet, and a Liberal party member who later succeeded Hatoyama as president,

[6] Information given by Kono Mitsu, Social Democrat, Ando Masazumi, Liberal, and Tsurumi Yusuke, Progressive, to writer, Mar.–Apr., 1948.

[7] The name "Liberal" was selected for two major reasons, the lesser being its pleasing sound in Occupation ears. More fundamental was its evocative appeal to early *Seiyukai* history in its identification with the Itagaki Taisuke Liberal party founded in 1881 in the crusading days of Meiji politics. As the *Kenseito*, it helped to form the *Seiyukai* in 1900. See H. S. Quigley, *Japanese Government and Politics* (New York, 1932), pp. 201–211.

[8] Party divisions and rivalry in the *Seiyukai* forced a search for funds in all directions. To suppose that the party relied on the Mitsui Zaibatsu is a gross oversimplification. In this period of factionalism, the Hatoyama *Seiyukai* was under special pressure, since it was least intimate with the military bureaucracy after 1937.

[9] Supreme Commander Allied Powers, *Summation of Non-Military Activities in Japan and Korea*, Feb., 1946, p. 33.

believed that the old constitution required functional rather than basic changes. Moreover, the party opposed the 1945 land reform act on the ground that it was too radical, a position that the old *Seiyukai*, with its large landowning class, would automatically have approved. It goes without saying that the Liberals were vehemently against Communism, another traditional *Seiyukai* position.[10]

The Progressive-Democratic Inheritance. While the Liberal party vigorously set about reorganization under a known and experienced leader, the other conservative forces were confused, fearful, and above all cautious. For the most part, they belonged to the *Dai Nippon Seiji Kai* (Great Japan Political Society), successor in 1945 to the war-time *Taisei Yokusan Seiji Kai* (Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society).[11] The former party in the Diet was a combination of four major pre-war political elements: the pre-war *Minseito*, the Nakajima (anti-Hatoyama) *Seiyukai*, the pure Kuhara *Seiyukai*, and those elected to the Diet for the first time in 1942.

Political movement within this amorphous mass began on September 14, 1945, when the *Dai Nippon Seiji Kai* was dissolved. The veteran *Minseito* member, Tsurumi Yusuke, was soon attempting to rally a nucleus of 150 members with three or more terms in the Diet in support of the retired politician-general, Ugaki Kazushige.[12] Tsurumi gained the support of former Hatoyama colleagues in the *Doko Kai*, the *Minseito* veterans Kawasaki Katsu and Saito Takao. Older party heads, however, soon combined to unite the whole of the former *Minseito*, the Nakajima *Seiyukai*, and the bulk of the first-term members into one major party. By November 16, sufficient agreement had been reached among the diverse elements to launch and christen the party the *Shimpoto* (Progressive party), although no agreement could be reached on the presidency.[13]

At the time of formation, the *Minseito* influence was not yet dominant in the Progressive party. Out of the originally claimed 288 Diet members,

[10] *Ibid.*, Nov., 1945, pp. 27, 31. Hatoyama favored curtailing the powers of the House of Peers and increasing those of the House of Representatives. His views were considerably more liberal than those of the Progressives. (Hatoyama to writer.)

[11] The Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society was formed of practically all Diet members elected in the Tojo election of 1942. It was organized in May, 1942, to overcome the objections to the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, the government, and the bad taste left by the outrageously controlled 1942 election. The Great Japan Political Society was organized on Mar. 13, 1945, and was dissolved in Sept., 1945.

[12] General Ugaki, favorite war minister in Minseito cabinets, had had political ambitions since 1931. As premier-designate in 1937, he had failed to organize a cabinet when the army refused to name a minister of war. Ugaki retired from post-surrender politics when it became clear that military men were *de trop* in the new era. He has since been purged.

[13] Officially termed the Japan Progressive party. See *Asahi Shimbun*, Dec. 5, 1945; *Nippon Times*, Nov. 19, Dec. 7, 1945.

those with pre-war *Minseito* records were but 32 per cent, those with *Seiyukai* inheritances 20 per cent, while the large plurality, 45 per cent, were the 116 first-term members.[14] The *Minseito* potential, however, was clear. Oasa Tadao, long chief secretary of the defunct *Minseito* and a leading figure in war-time politics, divided the chief influence over the men newly elected in 1942 with Maeda Yonezo and Kanemitsu Tsuneo, of the Nakajima and neutral *Seiyukai* factions. Moreover, since the first-term members were elected without the support of an established political organization, in the post-war era they were without the influence that might have been their right by numbers. The *Minseito* was the only group in the Progressive party with tested political roots.[15]

The *Minseito* seed was well planted. Because of the war taint of the Nakajima and other *Seiyukai* leaders, such as Kanemitsu and Ota Masataka, and the early initiative of Tsurumi, the latter held the important chief secretary's post in the party from the beginning. The *Minseito* also shared evenly the first appointed directors of the General Affairs Committee.[16] After the publication of the December, 1945, war criminal lists had barred many a potential aspirant, the presidency of the Progressives also passed to the *Minseito*. Machida Chuji, last president of the dissolved pre-war party, was installed in office immediately upon the close of the Diet session on December 18.[17]

As constituted in December, 1945, the Progressive party unquestionably contained the great bulk of the lackeys who had served the bureaucracy and the military ministries; most of its leaders with pre-war political experience had willingly supported the unitary-state principle of the fascist groups. The party was correctly labeled as possessing the most reactionary leadership and the greatest war culpability. Consequently, its platform was extremely cautious and extremely vague. It supported the Tenno system wholeheartedly, and held that the old constitution was adequate for the new age.[18]

Thus the dynamic of both post-war political organizations was clearly defined as a revival of pre-war leadership; and former personal rivalries continued to be exercised. The Hatoyama attempt at an all-embracing conservative party failed largely because of the strength of pre-war political allegiances.

[14] Original party lists were drawn without always first obtaining members' consent; for that reason, apparent party strength was fluctuating. Of the original 288 names posted, 20 later changed affiliation once or oftener.

[15] No general elections were held after the split in the *Seiyukai* before the parties were dissolved in June–Aug., 1940. See *Japan Year Book*, 1942.

[16] Pre-organization lists prepared by Tsurumi Yusuke, Nov., 1945.

[17] *Summation of Non-Military Activities in Japan and Korea*, Dec., 1945, p. 25; *Mainichi Shimbun*, Dec. 19, 1945.

[18] *Asahi Shimbun*, Nov. 17, 1945, carries the party platform in brief.

Effect of the Purge upon Post-War Leadership. The purge directive of January 4, 1946, all but extinguished the Progressive party. Of the more than 270 Diet members on January 1, only 32 remained eligible on March 1.[19] Small as this number was, fewer still were those experienced pre-war leaders eligible for political warfare. Inukai Ken alone remained of the old *Seiyukai* leadership; the *Minseito* had more in numbers, but, including Saito Takao, they were on the whole men who had never held important party posts in the pre-war era, and were without demonstrated talents for leadership or organization.[20] Thus the purge almost completely removed the old leadership, which was deeply rooted in either the *Minseito* or the Nakajima *Seiyukai*.

On the other hand, the purge stamped the future of the party as almost inescapably *Minseito*. By the elimination of the Nakajima faction, which had individual rather than organizational election roots, by the practical elimination of the first-term members, who generally had neither, the purge forced the party, for political survival, to rely on the older, deeper, proved sources of *Minseito* organization.[21]

Although the purge deflated the Progressive party, it gave it a new lease on life. No such benefits accrued to the Liberal party under Hatoyama. The initial January purge reduced its parliamentary membership from 46 to 18,[22] although it was left with a considerably larger proportion of its original leadership, including Hatoyama, than were the Progressives. But in thinning still more the already thin ranks of the Hatoyama "constitutional parliamentarians," the purge increased the margin of control held by the machine politicians—the technicians and the mechanics. This shift of influence, observable in January, 1946, handicapped the party in its strenuous efforts to pose as the only champion of the progressive, albeit conservative, elements.[23]

It was, however, the later application of the purge, the re-screening of elected Diet members between April and June, 1946, which definitively shaped the Liberal party in the post-war years. The damage of the second purge of 1946 was serious, for with the election over, ready substitution was impossible. The major blow, of course, was the purge of Hatoyama

[19] In all, 18 Diet members resigned between Dec. 1 and 17, 1945; of these, only one was a Progressive. The reduction from 288 to 270 represents quite accurately the over-sanguine listing by party founders. (Diet Secretariat records.)

[20] Leaders in pre-war *Minseito* agreed on this evaluation in statements to the writer, Apr., 1948.

[21] The *Minseito* lost to the *Seiyukai* by 2 seats in the *Seiyukai*-controlled election of 1928, swamped it in 1930, lost badly in the Manchurian-*Seiyukai* election of 1932, and won handily in 1936 and 1937. See *Japan Year Book* for election results.

[22] Of the 18, 3 were *Minseito*, 6 Hatoyama *Seiyukai*, 5 first-term members, 1 Nakajima *Seiyukai*, the rest in minor groups.

[23] *Summation of Non-Military Activities in Japan and Korea*, Feb., 1946, p. 33.

Ichiro, on the verge of being named prime minister, on May 3, 1946.[24] This loss stunned the party. It was left without an acceptable leader who could link the two party elements, the constitutional parliamentarians on the one hand and the party machinists on the other.[25] The former could not be replaced, successors to the latter were plentiful; when Kono Ichiro was purged in June, Ono Bambuko, trained in the Hara Kei school of fierce partisanship, quickly stepped into the empty shoes of the chief secretary.[26]

The balance in the party was not corrected by the selection of Hatoyama's successor. Yoshida Shigeru, Premier Shidehara's foreign minister, who was elected temporary leader of the party and named chairman of its executive committee on May 13, 1946, had had no previous political training and cared little for politics. He assumed the party leadership reluctantly.[27] The partisans, the technicians and mechanics, were thus left safely in control. It was largely this dominance of machine elements and the practical isolation of the parliamentarians, both close to Hatoyama in the original *Seiyukai*, that forced Ashida Hitoshi, one of the co-founders of the Liberal party, to bolt the party in March, 1947, and to join the Progressives in fashioning the new Democratic party on the 31st of that month.

The expanded provisions of the purge, announced on January 4, 1947, affected the strength and personnel of the local organizations of both parties far more than it did the character or leadership of either party. Of the two, the Democratic party, successor to the Progressives, was most affected by top leadership losses, while the Liberals were more affected by what little change of character occurred. As in 1946, the Democrats were hit worse in the pre-election phase of the purge, while the Lib-

[24] Hatoyama was the only politician of national stature purged by a special SCAP directive. He was cited for his position as chief secretary in the Tanaka cabinet, 1927–29, his restraints upon the schools as minister of education, his book of European travel, his 1942 election-statement, and his oppression of a farm movement. His supporters remain amazingly loyal, contending that he was a victim of a whirlwind leftist newspaper smear campaign which utterly ignored his consistent opposition to military régimes between 1936 and 1943, his support of constitutional government, and his parliamentary record over the same period. It is a fact that the most consistent supporters of parliamentary rights were among his intimate followers.

[25] Ando Masazumi was considered the chief loss among "parliamentarians" by party leaders.

[26] Ono had been an *ingaidan* to Hara Kei, a position combining the functions of trusted liaison man, messenger, and organization whip among both parliamentary and non-parliamentary groups.

[27] Yoshida accepted the position on three conditions, all of which posited that his occupancy would be temporary. He was not elected president until Aug. 18, 1946.

erals were most affected by the re-screening after the election of April 25, 1947.[28]

Since the 1947 purge had as one of its avowed major objectives the elimination of those who, on the local level, played leading rôles in military and fascist organizations, its operation both directly and indirectly forced a considerable reorganization of city, county, and prefectural branches of both parties.[29] Since many of those prominent enough to hold important local posts in the militaristic organizations also had *Minseito* and *Seiyukai* affiliations, this application of the purge struck at the very roots of the political strength which both of the conservative parties were arduously cultivating. Part of the vehement insistence of the conservative parties upon reducing the size of electoral districts in the election law revision of March, 1947, may be traced to the wide gaps the purge would cut in their local organizational network.

While the Democratic party lost fewer than 30 of its 1946 Diet members through the purge prior to the April 25, 1947, election, it lost heavily in leadership when four important figures in the founding of the party on March 31 of that year were declared ineligible less than two weeks later. These were Inukai Ken, Narahashi Wataru, Ishiguro Takeshi, and Chizaki Usaburo. Of the four, perhaps Inukai Ken was the most important—the last of the original *Seiyukai* leaders in the founding of the Progressive party. While his elimination and that of the other three was a blow to the election hopes of the party, it did not materially change its character. Inukai's skill in politics, however, would unquestionably have mitigated the sharp internal dissension which has characterized the Democratic ranks since May, 1947, when they were caught between the horns of the dilemma, the Liberal party's conservatism on the right and the coalition with the Social Democrats on the left.

The Liberal party lost, through the pre- and post-election purges, some of its leadership most closely identified with the party machine.[30] In so far as this was true, it helped toward the slow development of the reform or parliamentary group within the party, in opposition to the machine faction.

[28] Three of the four Liberals purged after the 1946 election were leading figures. The Socialists, notably, lost more men, but they were not major leaders. In the post-1947 election purges, 9 Liberals were removed, among them such leaders as Kita Reikichi, noted economist, Tanikawa Noboru, an experienced career official, and Ishi Mitsujiro, former *Asahi* executive and recent cabinet member under Yoshida. No top level Democrat or Socialist—save Hirano Rikizo—was removed after the election. While this apparently biased application of the purge ultimately hurt the Liberals, their opponents claim that it gave that party unfair electioneering advantage during the crucial April of 1947.

[29] *Summation of Non-Military Activities, Japan*, Jan., 1947.

[30] Notably Okubo Tomejiro, former mayor of Tokyo, and Hanashi Shingoro.

The original purge of 1946, by eliminating the experienced pre-war leaders, effectively ended the possibility that Japanese post-war conservative parties would be solely a direct, unquestioned continuation of pre-war parties with new labels. They were led by the purge to rely more hopefully upon pre-war affiliations in the local districts for their own rehabilitation. The second phase of the purge forced a renovation of personnel on the local level and removed most of the direct *Seiyukai* and *Minseito* influence on that level. The final purge, therefore, practically guaranteed the modified character of post-war political parties. The combination of the two, and especially the 1947 local purge, may presage a merger of the two streams of pre-1940 conservatism.

Progressive-Democratic Strategy. That the Progressive party successfully cultivates the old *Minseito* spheres of influence is clearly demonstrated by party rosters and the results of the two post-war elections. In the first election of April 10, 1946, the party hurriedly reached into the ranks of village headmen and local mayors to resurrect pre-war support. The fact that nearly all of the 94 successful Progressive party candidates with pre-war political affiliations were *Minseito*, testifies to the selective process adopted and to its success. Between 40 and 60 per cent of the Progressive party winners in 1946 owed their election to the traditional voting habits of *Minseito* districts, aided considerably by the plural ballot law adopted in 1945.[31] The continued influence of the Nakajima *Seiyukai*, though not readily traced, was evident in Gumma and Fukuoka prefectures, and the son of a neutral *Seiyukai* leader was easily returned from Oita prefecture. Although the pattern of vote distribution and elected membership revealed that the Progressives were weaker than had been anticipated in the traditional *Minseito* districts of Kyoto, Nagoya, Osaka, Kobe, and even in Fukuoka, they were more successful in the *Minseito* strongholds in Kyushu and Shikoku and in central and northern Japan. More significantly, perhaps, the 1946 election indicated that the Adachi Kenzo splinter from the *Minseito*, the *Kokumin Domei*, had returned to the Progressive-*Minseito* fold after fifteen years.[32] On the other hand, it suggested that agricultural support in *Minseito* areas of the Hokkaido, Nagano, Hiroshima, Miyazaki, Kagoshima, and to a lesser extent in Aichi and Osaka, was turning toward the Coöperative Democratic

[31] Inukai Ken to writer, Dec., 1947. The plural ballot system, coupled with large plural-member constituencies, provided the voter with at least two votes in all but 14 electoral districts, in which he had three. Designed to aid new and minority parties against established organizations on the right, it resulted in capricious voting which makes analysis of election figures difficult. The writer's chauffeur, for instance, voted for a Liberal and a Communist; many of the 39 women elected admittedly owed their election to second-choice "courtesy" ballots.

[32] Notably in Kumamoto prefecture, Kyushu.

party (*Kyodo Minshuto*), founded on May 21, 1946, and reorganized as the People's Coöperative party (*Kokumin Kyodoto*), on March 8, 1947. Although one of the principal organizers of this party was Funada Chu, of the Nakajima *Seiyukai* faction, his influence evaporated when he was purged. From the outset the Coöperatives have wooed the farm voter.[33]

The 1946 election proved that the Progressive party could live if it could hold and expand the old *Minseito* allegiance. The concentration on this strategy was revealed in the character of the 24 independents and minor party men who joined the Progressive party in 1946–47. Although recruited largely through the efforts of the *Seiyukai* leader Inukai Ken, the majority were elected from former *Minseito* constituencies. Moreover, it appears that many of the 31 recruits who joined with the Progressives to form the Democratic party on March 31, 1947, were persuaded to do so not only because of available party funds, but also because many of them, coming from pre-war *Minseito* districts, felt their chances of re-election to be best served by the support of that party's post-war heir.[34]

Although there was a definite Democratic party attempt to revive certain pre-war *Seiyukai* political nets in the 1947 election, the outstanding feature of the result was the increasing parallelism between the Democratic popular support and that accorded the *Minseito* in the 1936 and 1937 elections. Moreover, a study of the Democratic party rosters and of intra-party activity following the 1947 election indicates that the party posts and leadership are being assumed by men who with but few exceptions are of the *Minseito* tradition.

Liberal Strategy. The Liberal party enjoyed a success even more notable in utilizing the pre-war *Seiyukai* districts in the 1946 election. Like the Progressives, the Liberals had reached into the ranks of prefectural assemblymen and local leaders for new candidates. In the first post-war election, however, the Liberal party, led by Hatoyama, not only cultivated its *Seiyukai* heritage but also strove to swamp the Progressives on the whole conservative front. The relative failure of this program was due to three factors: the capricious operation of the plural-ballot system, the

[33] In 1946, the Progressives failed to win any seats in the Hokkaido; the Coöperatives won 7. In Nagano, a former *Minseito* leader was credited with Coöperative success in one constituency. In Hiroshima, after the application of the purge and the affiliation of independents, the Coöperatives held 6 seats to the Progressives' none. A leading Hiroshima Coöperative, Matsumoto Takizo, is regarded as the heir to a *Minseito* seat. In Kagoshima, a former *Minseito* Diet member, Yamamoto Sanehiko, became the post-election president of the Coöperatives, but was purged in Dec., 1946. Miki Takeo, who succeeded him as president, has personal but no organizational ties with the neutral *Seiyukai* leader, Kanemitsu Tsuneo.

[34] Three came from Akita, 4 each from Kyōto and Hyogo, one each from Hiroshima, Ishikawa, Mie, and Fukushima prefectures, where the pre-war *Minseito* had been predominant. (Diet Secretariat records.)

character of party leadership, and, of course, the residual strength of pre-war political rivalry in voting habits.

The 1947 election, even more clearly than that of 1946, showed *Seiyukai* and Liberal party parallelism. This relationship is the more notable because the Democrats and Liberals fought each other in that election almost as vigorously as they did the common opponent, the Social Democratic party. It is easy, however, to exaggerate the direct influence of pre-war voting habits as the controlling factor in the 1947 election. The number of successful candidates who had connections with brewery, food, fisheries, and other business interests, or who had educational association backing, testifies to the power and weight of other forces.[35]

While many new Diet men in 1946 and 1947 owed their election to post-war alignments, the identification of these men as "substitutional candidates" fails to distinguish between those who owed their election to such blocs and those handpicked as heirs of a purged politician of pre-war standing. The number of Diet members in the first category in 1947 was approximately 40 per cent, while those in the second category probably number less than 10 per cent. Since the transfer of a personal political following is most easily accomplished in the rural areas and least easily in the amorphous urban communities, the Liberal party in 1947 contained more of such political heirs than the Democrats.[36]

Those who speak glibly of the number of "substitutional candidates" usually imply that undesirable influence had been exercised, mainly of course by political purgees. Because of prohibition from open political activity, however, purgees had to exercise their political influence indirectly and personally, not through public appeal for votes. The number of political casualties in the two post-war elections, as well as in the pre-war decade, indicates that while the influence of such prominent characters was not unimportant, it was not decisive. Their influence was most effectively exerted in the selection of the official party candidates. It was due to the weight of their judgment of the men who could rally the latent political support of a district.[37]

Because of the factors noted above, plus the tremendous importance of funds and the increasing death-rate of pre-war leadership, it is probable that the conservative parties have used and expanded the latent support each had in the spheres of pre-war parties rather than been controlled by these affiliations. There is no question that this dénouement is the result

[35] Men with such business or professional affiliations were "of course" elected, leaders of all parties have told the writer.

[36] Chief political editor of the *Asahi Shimbun* to writer, Apr., 1948; Tsurumi Yusuke to writer, Mar., 1948.

[37] It is traditional in Japanese politics for each party to designate its "official" candidate in each district, although anyone can run on the ticket.

of the purge in removing former leaders, bringing new faces to the fore, and of the physical fact of the occupation.

Inherited Traits in Party Behavior. The shift in the balance of power within the Liberal party, in favor of the *Seiyukai* party-machine-trained group after the 1946 purge, became more marked during the ensuing twelve months of the Yoshida coalition government of Liberals and Progressives. The Liberal party clearly dominated the coalition. Thus, with a clear-cut party control, the machine elements were able to entrench themselves within the organization through distribution of the patronage and privileges of government office.[38]

This all but complete control of the party by the partisans encouraged the development of the old *Seiyukai* traits of dictation and aggressiveness. It appeared in the "Higai Incident" of August, 1946, when the Liberal party leaders used the speaker of the House of Representatives, a Liberal, to lead a protest to the Premier, a Liberal, seeking reversal of an amendment previously adopted by the Constitutional Revision Committee of the House, whose chairman was also a Liberal.[39] It was reflected in the growing influence in the party of the aggressive Finance Minister, Ishibashi Tanzan, increasingly regarded as the most likely future leader of the party. Not without significance were a few references to him as a "little Hara." There was marked assertiveness in the opposition conducted by party leaders to the Premier's attempts in January and February, 1947, to persuade the Social Democrats to join the Liberal-Progressive coalition. It became more pronounced in the callous treatment accorded their Progressive partners in the last months of 1946 and early 1947. The cool decision to take advantage of that party's difficult political position did much to encourage Inukai and Narahashi of the Progressives to form the Democratic party with Ashida and his bolting Liberals in March, 1947. Parliamentary tactics reminiscent of the *Seiyukai* were evident in the methods taken by the Liberals to secure the election law revision of March, 1947. Such traits reached a climax in the party's tactics in creating disturbances in the Diet to delay action on the bitterly contested Socialist proposal for a coal mines control act in the fall of 1947.[40]

Control of the government also exposed the party to the liaisons traditionally tempting to partisan political machine leaders of Japan. That such elements as the "gumi" (company) gang leaders, Ozu Kennosuke

[38] These included provision for housing, transportation, and food. Holders of government posts were more effective electioneers than private citizens. Even the relatively innocuous posts of parliamentary vice-minister and councillor were keenly competed for.

[39] The incident was settled by the resignation of Speaker Higai after a no-confidence vote was defeated on Aug. 24, 1946.

[40] The Liberal party supplied members with much *saké* and many instructions.

and Sekine Ken, were affiliated in any way with the Liberal party is probably an inevitable result of that party's control of the government during the early stages of the occupation. Only by a distorted method of reasoning, however, can it be argued that they possessed any control over the party. They were hands and feet, but definitely not the brains, of the party. Such connections were typical of pre-war party liaisons.[41]

A measure of the *Seiyukai* character of the Liberal party may also be seen in the fact that the four former *Minseito* members of the Liberal party who remained after the bolt of Ashida and the purge of two others gradually became affiliated with the opposition to the machine elements in the party. Eventually they refused to follow their colleagues into the Democratic-Liberal party when it was organized on March 15, 1948.[42]

On the other hand, the Progressive party possessed no experienced party machine men to seek control of the party in 1946–1947. Moreover, as the junior member of the coalition Yoshida government, it had fewer opportunities, hence less temptation, to develop the extra-party liaisons effected by the Liberals. A struggle ensued within the party between the minority group, centering around freshman members and led by the *Seiyukai* leader, Inukai Ken, and the older party stalwarts of *Minseito* heritage who took Shidehara Kijuro, party president, as their symbol. The efforts of the younger group to renovate the party's reputation, organization, and platform, to rid it of the taint of its founding, did not produce the sharp tension which later developed within its successor, the Democratic party, largely because of Inukai's general adroitness. Even though deep fissures developed after May, 1947, into eventual splits in the party, the Democrats generally discussed their differences freely. A partial explanation for this unusual laxity was the leadership's fear that arbitrary use of authority would only worsen the internal situation. Whether it was the liberal use of money, fear of an open party break, lack of strong leadership, or a conviction of the wisdom of discussion, the Democratic party in 1947 moved steadily toward procedures resembling those of the pre-1937 *Minseito*. In so doing, the Democratic party changed places with the *Jiyuto*, which in early 1946 under Hatoyama was clearly the more progressive of the conservative parties. The Democratic-Liberals are now farther to the right.

[41] An American correspondent's story in the *Nippon Times* of Nov. 23, 1947, which appeared in other papers at the same time, linked such organizations and a loosely identified network of other connections into a "hidden government" of subversive intentions. As in the famous "Tsuji case" of Tsuji Karoku, it betrayed considerable ignorance of Japanese traditions and manners as well as of American counterparts. It caused serious consternation in Japanese official circles and led to Diet interpellations on the subject on Nov. 26, 1947. It confused the boss-gang with top level policy planning.

[42] These, plus two others, retained the name of the Japan Liberal party. (Diet Secretariat records.)

The Democratic party's alliance with the Social Democrats and the People's Coöperative party in the Katayama cabinet, May, 1947–February, 1948, and later in a cabinet under its own president, Ashida Hitoshi, suggests a further thin trace of inheritance from the *Minseito*, even though the latter coalition was motivated chiefly by a desire to preserve the strength and unity of the party.[43] The Progressive, later the Democratic party, as the heir of the pre-war *Minseito* roots in the urban centers, was most affected among conservative parties by the rise of the socialist movement after the war, since it constituted a threat to its constituencies in urban and intellectual circles. Political necessity bred recognition if not acceptance. Whereas Hatoyama's coquetry with the Socialists in 1946 had but the thin base of a war-time association as common opponents to the Tojo régime, the Democratic alliance had a narrow but common ground of principle upon which to establish a working compromise. The Democratic Liberals are as basically anti-socialist as they are anti-communist, faithfully reflecting the *Seyukai* position and kindred roots in agricultural and industrial areas.[44]

A comparison of party platforms in post-war years with those of the pre-war *Minseito* and *Seiyukai* would be fruitless in view of their consistent vagueness and the domination of both periods by extra-party forces. Only lately have the platforms of either party exhibited definiteness and particularity. This particularity is the result of pressures inherent in the necessities of a coalition government among major but not majority parties, not of the normal evolution of a political philosophy. The most detailed exposition of Democratic principles, for example, was a set of compromises drawn up in February, 1948, to gain the support of the Social Democratic party for the Democratic-led Ashida cabinet.[45] It may be said, however, that a general emphasis on reconstruction is appearing in the platforms of both parties, the Democratic-Liberals stressing internal, the Democrats external, factors. One can easily over-reach himself, however, in attempting to draw any comparison with characteristics of the *Minseito* and *Seiyukai* pre-war platforms. The intricacies in the evolution of the relatively vague party platforms of the two major parties since 1945 is a subject in itself.

Survival of Pre-war Bureaucracy. The ministries with the chief political influence in the pre-war period were those of Home Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Finance, and, most of all, War and the Navy. All had strong ties with an exerted heavy pressure upon the parties through their con-

[43] Statements of Democratic party leaders to writer, Feb.–Mar., 1948.

[44] This is made bluntly clear in Yoshida's statements at the time he refused to enter a four-party coalition, May 19, 1947. The same views were expressed in the initial launching by the Liberals of the "national salvation party" drive to unite conservatives, Oct.–Nov., 1947.

[45] *Summation of Non-Military Activities, Japan*, Feb., 1948, pp. 37–38.

trol of funds, the police, fiscal policy, and the varied organs of propaganda.

The military defeat in the war, the abolition of the War and Navy ministries, the proscribing of regular army and navy officers by the purge, plus the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers, have well-nigh eliminated the direct influence of the army and navy. A certain residual influence remains, inevitably, as shown in the recurrent political interest focused on the retired General Ugaki Kazushige.[46]

The notorious influence of the Home Ministry in the pre-war days, exerted through control of prefectural governors and the police, has been weakened in the post-war era by the popular election of governors and a partially decentralized police system. Moreover, the Home Ministry was abolished on January 1, 1948, and its functions divided between several component boards. How permanent a check this will be on bureaucratic influence remains to be seen. Subordinate officials remain in the boards and ministries, of course, who are still influenced by former ministerial officials in the old bureaucracy, inclined to them by ties of personal loyalty and association. However, those ties are now divorced from the power formerly held to control by official command; their influence rests upon a much less direct relationship which time and changing personnel may increasingly minimize.[47]

The Foreign Office exerts influence in its current rôle as the Japanese agency of liaison with the Allied Powers, a liaison controlled by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. That influence is not uncontested, however, as each political party and each organ of the Japanese government gradually have developed their own liaison agencies. It is the Finance Ministry which has retained the greatest share of its pre-war political influence. Through the execution of financial policy, through taxation and industrial loans, and through its direct relationship to the reparation and export problems, it exerts an economic power obviously politically important at the present time. Between May, 1946, and May, 1947, the ministry was headed by the Liberal, Ishibashi Tanzan, and since that date the post has been occupied by Democrats. None of these men had direct political affiliations with pre-war parties.[48]

While the direct political control of previously potent governmental bureaus has been sharply curtailed, their influence in the shaping and direction of legislation continues immense. This is due in large measure to the absence in the major parties of highly qualified specialists in the tech-

[46] Speculation as to Ugaki's clearance from the purge and leadership in a revived rightist conservative party was still current in politically-minded Japanese circles in Apr., 1948, despite Ugaki's 77 years.

[47] For an interesting if general account of post-war bureaucracy and its traditional power, see John M. Maki, "Rôle of the Bureaucracy in Japan," *Pacific Affairs*, Dec., 1947, pp. 391–406.

[48] The Democrats were Kurusu Takao, June, 1947–Feb., 1948, a personal friend of Ashida Hitoshi, and Kitamura Tokutaro, since Mar., 1948.

nical fields of modern legislation. Such specialists are gradually being developed, but whether, in the era of an inevitable dominance of administrative law, they can successfully match strength with career civil servants in ministerial bureaus is a moot question which time alone will answer.

New Sources of Party Funds. Party structure, as well as party action in the Diet, and non-parliamentary liaisons, have followed, in general, pre-war patterns. But in the fundamental matter of party financing, a temporary difference appears. Prior to 1940, political parties relied upon large single-fund contributions from the *zaibatsu*, government slush funds, and special funds of the military forces. With the *zaibatsu* stripped of power by occupation policy, military sources dried up by defeat and dissolution, and secret government funds eliminated from the national budget, parties have been compelled to seek new sources of campaign funds.[49]

In a war-devastated country faced by the necessity of rehabilitation and the urgent requirements of the occupation, the construction companies were the first of the new sources to appear. In the 1946 election, and until mid-1947, the parties obtained their largest contributions from such sources. In the main, the contributions were legitimate, but because of the stringent limitations of the election laws, which always lagged behind the pace of inflation, the political application of the funds often was disguised. The growing importance of money in winning support for the new faces in post-war political battles, plus the element of favoritism involved in the award of government construction contracts, made an exposé of such political contributions headline news. Consequently, more headline hunting than sober analysis and understanding has been commonly indulged in by commentators. With the adoption of competitive bidding and the satisfaction of occupation construction needs, the building bonanza began to collapse in mid-1947.

For the 1947 election, the parties were financed largely by dealers in scarce commodities and brokers for the sale and distribution of government stockpiles remaining at the close of the war. As with the construction companies, it appears that the Liberal party initially was most involved, because it controlled the essential administrative agencies during the twelve months of the Yoshida government. The probings of a special Diet investigation committee and the concentrated efforts of occupation authorities to eliminate the source of such operations are expected to dry up this well of party revenue.[50]

[49] See article in next issue by Dr. Harry E. Wildes for a more detailed treatment of this aspect and a different interpretation.

[50] A special Diet Hoarded Goods Committee was established in July, 1947, and was reorganized in Dec., 1947, as the Illegal Transactions Investigation Committee. See *Summation of Non-Military Activities, Japan*, Jan., 1948, pp. 29–32; Feb., 1948, pp. 42–44.

The third source of party funds centers in government control of industrial loans to essentially sound but hard-pressed companies. This source became important coincidentally with strengthened measures to levy and collect income tax assessments, and with growing pressure from labor for wage increases. Since the Democratic party was dominant in the financial policies of the Katayama coalition government (May, 1947–February, 1948), during this period it was the party most involved in public allegations that such loans were political. Public attention, rivals' criticisms, and a current Diet investigation will tend to eliminate this device for obtaining "political revenue."[51]

It is clear that each of these three sources of party financing is essentially temporary, being closely identified with the transitory features of an economy defeated in war and under an occupying power. Whether future and more permanent sources of funds will be the export and trading circles, as successors to the dominant *zaibatsu* contributors of the 1930's, remains to be seen.

Possibilities of Merger. Since Hatoyama's early attempt in 1945 and the Liberals' gesture following the 1946 purge, there have been numerous moves to merge the two major conservative parties. Most of these have been motivated, not by considerations of principle, but by competition from left-wing forces.[52] Pending complete merger, the evidence of a union of the *Minseito* and *Seiyukai* influence is more superficial than real. The bolt of the Ashida Liberals to the Democratic party in 1947 included some *Minseito* elements, but the *Seiyukai* members were generally considered to be those closest in temperament to the *Minseito*.[53] No noticeable evidence of a trend in other than the personal spheres of the bolters was discernible in the 1947 election.

A more recent augury of a limited merger of the two pre-war political spheres was the union of the Shidehara Democrats with the Liberals in the new Democratic-Liberal party on March 15, 1948. It is believed, however, that this union also represented an individual rather than an organizational merger.[54] More significant has been the determined effort of the Democratic-Liberals to undermine the opposition in the localities by luring prefectural assemblymen and organizational leaders of the rival party into their fold. There have been definite signs of a partial success in this effort.[55] The 1947 purge, by removing a leadership generally identified with pre-war political affiliations, was an aid to this effort. On the

[51] *Ibid.* The Japanese press is currently full of "reports" of such transactions.

[52] Major moves occurred in Feb., Aug., and Dec., 1946, Feb., 1947; steady pressure has been applied since Oct., 1947. Each period is notable for upsurges of labor unrest or a "threat" of socialistic measures.

[53] Tsurumi Yusuke and Seko Koichi to writer, Apr., 1948.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] Notably in Tochigi, Ibaragi, and Fukushima prefectures; less in Aichi and certain prefectures in southern Japan.

other hand, the cultivation of local leaders has been most intensive in those areas from which the bolting Democrats came, and may be an evidence of uncertainty of support in their own districts.

This attention to the local plane of political activity is a most encouraging sign, betokening the breakdown of traditional voting blocs influential in the first two post-war elections. Changing faces in leadership, new political issues, and changed formulas of government resulting from legislative and constitutional reforms have lessened the dependability of traditional lines of allegiance. If the conservative parties merge, or if one achieves unquestioned dominance, the result will be less a merger of *Minseito* and *Seiyukai* residues than a development of post-war political organizations related to the former only through many mutations.

Conclusion. The purge of 1946, in removing national leadership, and that of 1947, in striking at the local tap roots, prevented the direct continuity of pre-war political parties in the post-war milieu. The purges gave the shattered Progressives a lease on life and a *Minseito* inheritance, while they left the Democratic-Liberal party in the hands of the party machine. The direct influence of the Nakajima *Seiyukai* has all but disappeared, and, in 1948 the Democratic-Liberals appear to have once again drawn all *Seiyukai* elements under one banner. Yet it appears that both parties have utilized these ancestral influences rather than that they have been controlled by them, and that these influences, both organizational and individual, are fading. Political influence in government bureaus is no longer matched by their legislative and governmental powers; party financing is troubling all political leaders, conscious of the ephemeral character of present sources of revenue. A merger of pre-war *Minseito* and *Seiyukai* electoral spheres has not yet definitely appeared, but the increasing tillage of the local political soil indicates that a significant combination may eventually appear.

Japanese politics is no better and no worse than that found in similar situations elsewhere. Its greatest handicap has been the scarcity of truly talented political leadership thoroughly immersed in the democratic tradition and conversant with the problems and trends of the present and capable of planning for the future. It is certain, given time and a continued support of the liberal elements, that that leadership will appear. Then the political organism will no longer exhibit any recognizable stamp of the political chromosomes inherited from the pre-war decade.

III. JAPAN'S POST-WAR SOCIALIST PARTY*

JOHN SAFFELL
Mt. Union College

The development of Japan's Socialist party since V.J. Day may logically be considered in three periods. The first period, that of reorganization,

* Nothing contained in this article is to be construed as in any sense official.

began in August, 1945, and continued until the first post-war election in April, 1946. The second period comprised the months between April, 1946, and June, 1947, during which Socialists were gathering strength in the chief opposition party. The third period, from May, 1947, to February, 1948, saw the revolutionary passage of Japan's government into the hands of a Socialist-led cabinet.

Left-Wing Realignment: August, 1945–April, 1946. Against a background of military defeat, dissolution of war-time political agencies, and resulting efforts at political realignment should be set the movement which led to formation of the present *Shakaito* (Social Democratic party).[1] By late August of 1945, the political ferment was active; by early September, Tokyo papers were reporting that remnants of the old proletarian and agrarian organizations—*Ronoto* (Laborers' and Farmers' party), *Nominto* (Farmers' party), and *Shakai Taishuto* (Social Mass party)—were already drawing the lines of the new party formation.

During these early stages of organization, it was not clear which of the pre-war proletarian groups would coalesce; more than two months were spent in political maneuverings before the Social Democratic party was formally organized in November, 1945. Especially prominent in the organization process were the following three men: Kagawa Toyohiko, the Christian leader; Abe Isoo, a founder of the Japan Socialist party in 1901; and Takano Iwasaburo, a former adviser of the Social Mass party.

These early organizers were successful in bringing together a hodgepodge of political constituents. The *Nippon Times*, Tokyo, in early November, provided an excellent characterization of the party:

> "The present Social Democratic Party is a heterogeneous alliance of all socialist groups . . . . There are the intellectual utopians and the religious idealists, the hard-headed laborites who have come up through the rough and tumble mill of union activities—incidentally divided among themselves between the right-wing and the left-wing factions, the opportunists who swerved from socialism during the war but who are now trying to come back into the fold like repentant prodigals, and the uncompromising and unforgiving orthodox materialistic Marxists who have always been single-mindedly devoted to the Cause."

Diverse as the constituents of the party were, however, it obviously did not include the bulk of these "uncompromising and unforgiving materialistic Marxists." Communist political activity quickened after the release of political prisoners in October, 1945. Soon thereafter, Communists pro-

[1] The term *Shakaito* means literally "Social party." According to Kato Kanju and his wife, Kato Shizue, both left-wing *Shakaito* leaders, the translation "Social Democratic" is used to indicate the party's ideological similarity to other such-named political parties throughout the world. But the Japanese words meaning "Social Democratic party," namely *Shakai Minshuto*, are not used, since this term would link the new party in the minds of the Japanese people with the old *Shakai Minshuto*, which appealed more to intellectuals than to the masses.

posed that Social Democrats join them in formation of a United Front. Like proposals were to be oft repeated; even by December, 1945, the Socialists had rejected the third such Communist proffer.[2]

While Socialists and Communists have not formed a United or Joint Front on the national level, some Socialists have openly favored certain planks of the Communist platform. Thus when the question of the future of the emperor system was a throbbing issue, Socialists could not agree among themselves on the future of the Tenno. Ono Chunichi, at the time a member of the party's Central Executive Committee, threatened to bolt if the Standing Committee refused to alter its policy decision of "democracy under the emperor system." Ono was supported in his stand by such prominent left-wingers as Arahata Kanson,[3] former Communist, and Matsumoto Jiichiro,[4] revered leader of the left-wing Socialists and champion of the *eta* (outcasts).[5] Ono's stand was condemned by a party spokesman who declared that Ono was apparently nearer to the Communist than to the Socialist line.[6] The emperor issue has ceased to plague Socialist unity, but a variety of other issues have been raised in later months to make intra-party cleavage the most important single characteristic of the post-war Socialist party in Japan.

Socialist disunity, however, did not flare into the open on the question of war guilt. In the 89th extraordinary session of the Diet (November 26–December 18, 1945), in which this issue was discussed, Socialists proposed that all Diet members active in the war-time totalitarian political organ-

[2] *Nippon Times*, Dec. 30, 1945.

[3] Arahata Kanson has long been identified with Japan's labor movement. Since the end of the war he has been active as a left-wing Socialist leader, though he is not so influential as Kato Kanju and Suzuki Mozaburo.

[4] Matsumoto Jiichiro, wealthy Fukuoka bachelor, is an important left-wing leader. He is highly respected by the entire party and was elected vice-president of the House of Councillors in May, 1947. Matsumoto's forthright "democratic practices," such as his refusal to wear a necktie even on formal occasions, and his unwillingness to be received in audience by the emperor, draw considerable press comment. See *Nippon Times*, May 24, 1947, and Jan. 23, 1948.

[5] The *eta*, or social outcasts, are so regarded because of the occupations in which their ancestors were engaged. Though the *eta* were granted legal equality in 1867, the effect of centuries of discrimination continues. The *Suiheisha* (Water-Level Society), which works for *eta* uplift, and which is now led by Matsumoto, is an important affiliate of the Social Democratic party. Though the *Suiheisha* is a target of Communist infiltration, it is probable that Matsumoto's influence will continue to tie the group to the left-wing Socialists.

[6] *Nippon Times*, Dec. 13, 1945. Ono expressed his disagreement with Socialist policy in a letter to the *Yomiuri Shimbun*, rather than through normal party channels. Such breaches of discipline on the part of Japanese Socialists are relatively common. Likewise, in January, 1947, the left-wingers, without consultation with other party officials, drafted and gave to the press their own program for meeting the economic crisis.

izations, and the chief officers of the Diet, should resign. This was a considerably stronger stand than that taken by the so-called Progressive party, which at the time controlled a majority. The latter held that the question of resignation should be left to the conscience of each individual Diet member.

Nevertheless, when initiative on this question of war responsibility had passed from the Japanese to SCAP (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers), with the issuance of the basic purge directive on January 4, 1946, Socialists found that their party was not to go unscathed. When that party was originally formed, it had only 17 members in the Diet, i.e., the surviving war-time Diet, elected in 1942. Of these original *Shakaito* members, more than half were purged. Thus it is apparent that the organizers of Japan's Socialist party included men who, though in some instances hesitatingly, had "gone along" with their country's program of totalitarianism and aggression.

In the general election of April 10, 1946, the Social Democrats elected 92 of their candidates to the 466-member House of Representatives. The *Shakaito* received 9,858,408 votes, about 18 per cent of the 55,448,879 votes cast. Since the Socialists represented a new political organization, and since the old-line conservatives were notoriously well-entrenched, particularly in rural constituencies, this showing of the *Shakaito* may be taken as one evidence of the impact of defeat upon Japan's political life. Heretofore, Socialist and left-wing members in the Japanese Diet had constituted a mere sprinkling. In April, 1946, the Socialists demonstrated that they had become a major political entity.

When *Shakaito* voting strength as displayed in the 1946 election is analyzed on a geographic basis, some correlation between areas of the greatest population density and areas of heaviest relative support for the *Shakaito* is apparent. Such correlation is to be expected, but it should be pointed out that it is easy to over-emphasize the Japanese farmer's heritage of conservatism. A pre-war observer has stated that the "discontent and radical tendencies" which are usually associated with an urban proletariat are in Japan "mainly confined to the rural population."[7] And Dr. E. H. Norman maintains that the Japanese peasant is by his heritage a social conservative but an economic radical.[8] It may at least be suggested that if the Japanese farmers were not at present enjoying unparalleled prosperity—because of the post-war inflation and the enormous demand for foodstuffs—they would constitute an element of considerable potential

[7] W. R. Crocker, *The Japanese Population Problem* (New York, 1931), p. 93. Quoted in E. H. Norman, *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State* (New York, 1940), pp. 79–80. Crocker's statement that radical tendencies are "mainly confined" to the rural population could not be defended as applicable to post-war Japan.

[8] E. H. Norman, *op. cit.*, pp. 79–80.

strength for such a party as the *Shakaito*. It is an over-simplification to speak unqualifiedly of the "conservatism of the Japanese farmer" and to believe that this agricultural element could not conceivably become an important base of Socialist power.

The Shakaito Becomes the Opposition: April, 1946–June, 1947. In the first months after surrender, the *Shakaito* had shown at least the possibility that the split ranks of the pre-war proletarians had closed in a phalanx. Japan's left-wing political forces, buoyed up by their successes in the 1946 election, united to stage the giant "Down with Shidehara" demonstration on April 7. With the subsequent collapse of the Shidehara cabinet, the Socialists, by reason of the strength they had shown in the election, were given an opportunity to participate in a national coalition cabinet. That party, however, as the price of its participation, demanded that the premier be chosen from Socialist ranks. This was obviously tantamount to a refusal. Consequently, the Yoshida cabinet was formed solely by conservative parties.

This evidence of conservative cohesion stimulated further discussion of Socialist-Communist coöperation. The Socialists, as a result of Communist proddings for a "popular front," developed plans for the formation of a "Democratic League for National Salvation." Communists and left-wing Socialists favored inclusion both of leftist parties and of their affiliated bodies. Communists held that such a union of all democratic forces was necessary to ward off possible mass unemployment likely to result from industrial reorganization, to protect farmers from heavy taxes, and to oppose the government's oppressive policy toward mass demonstrations.

After interminable discussions and negotiation, the Socialists finally declared that conditions had not yet "matured" for Communist participation in the League, and voted against inclusion of the Communists. Socialists indicated that they would not ally themselves with mass organizations outside the Diet, but would follow the "legislature-first" principle. Left-wing Socialists—men like Kato Kanju, Suzuki Mozaburo, and Kuroda Hisao—stoutly opposed these decisions. But the right-wingers carried the day and adopted the suggestion of Morito Tatsuo,[9] who master-minded the Democratic League. He insisted that the democratic movement could be better strengthened if the "battle-line" were shortened.

[9] Morito Tatsuo became minister of education in the first Socialist cabinet. Originally an academic man, Morito in his younger days taught economics at Tokyo Imperial University, but was expelled because of his writings on Kropotkin. Morito's intellectual capacity, particularly his ability as a theoretician, is unquestioned. But some contemporary observers, particularly left-wingers, complain that his youthful enthusiasm has been dimmed and that he relishes theories for their own sake rather than for their social or political effectiveness.

The formation of the Democratic League for National Salvation is important, not because the organization itself became influential, but because it brought to an end serious proposals for Socialist-Communist cooperation. To be sure, Communists have continued to ask for Socialist support, and there have been many instances of coöperation between the two parties on the prefectural and local levels for campaign purposes; but not since the summer of 1946 has the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist party formally considered the question of an alliance with the farther left.[10] The Socialists, at least the right-wing, were looking toward the practical matter of entering the government.

In the summer of 1946, Socialists were busy considering not only the question of inter-party relationships but also the provisions of Japan's new constitution.[11] Left and right wings were in disagreement as to how the Socialists could best use their advantageous position resulting from the fact that government parties alone did not control the two-thirds majority necessary for passage of the draft constitution. Right-wingers favored a conciliatory approach. They were willing simply to "bargain" with government parties. Left-wing elements sought to push their advantage to the limit and to demand that the final document include *in toto* the revisions favored by their party.[12]

A more precise idea as to the sort of constitution favored by left-wing Socialists can be gained from the recommendations made by the Institute of Socialist Political Science, a group of leftist scholars and social critics, some of whom are high in Socialist party circles. This group favored such principles as the following: election of a constitutional assembly, reference of the draft constitution to a referendum, an explicit statement of the sovereignty of the people, Diet approval for an emperor's accession to the throne, restriction of the emperor's prerogatives to ceremonial functions, and a unicameral parliamentary system.[13]

A number of these proposals were included among the amendments actually sponsored by the Social Democrats toward the end of the consideration of the draft constitution by the House of Representatives. These amendments were voted down by the House, but this did not prevent the Socialist party from voting the same day in favor of the Government draft. Reasons for this easy Socialist acquiescence are not hard to find: first, the draft constitution was an amazingly liberal document and none but the far-leftists could find much justification for strenuous opposition; and second, it was generally recognized that the original draft

[10] Obviously, growing tension between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. was one factor in cooling Socialist interest in a joint front.

[11] See H. S. Quigley, "Japan's Constitutions: 1890 and 1947," in this REVIEW, Vol. 41, pp. 865–874 (Oct., 1947).

[12] *Nippon Times*, June 27, 1946.

[13] *Ibid.*, June 15, 1946.

had actually been prepared by occupation authorities and that consequently general acceptance was demanded by force of circumstances.[14]

Although the Government parties tried to take credit for adoption of the new liberal constitution, this achievement was not sufficient to bolster the waning prestige of the Yoshida cabinet. The continuing food crisis and an ever-worsening inflation made the cabinet increasingly unpopular. Such factors during the late summer and fall of 1946 brought the Government face to face with the rising tide of labor unrest. Public opinion polls indicated enhanced regard for the Socialists, not, perhaps, so much because of confidence in socialism as because of dissatisfaction with life under the conservative régime.

These conditions led the Socialists to embark upon an active anti-Yoshida campaign. Realizing the public's strong dissatisfaction, the *Shakaito* sensed the political necessity for standing as the champion of Japan's labor if labor forces were not to drift more freely into Communist ranks. Consequently, the party sponsored, on December 17, 1946, the great "Down with Yoshida" rallies throughout the nation.[15]

In the following weeks, Yoshida sought to bring some Socialists into his government. His obvious desire was, by affording labor representation in the cabinet, to lessen the clamor of the masses. Negotiations, long and involved, were complicated at various stages by such problems as the following: the left-wing Socialists' demand for a Socialist premier; Socialist insistence on dismissal of the unpopular minister of finance, Ishibashi Tanzan; disagreement as to the number and choice of portfolios to be assigned to the Socialists; and the question of eligibility, under the purge, of certain Socialists slated for cabinet posts. The problem was further complicated in its later stages by threats of a general strike, which many people believed were being made by left-wing Socialists (and Communists) for political purposes. In the end, however, on January 31, 1947, the general strike was called off by order of General MacArthur, and on the same day Yoshida revamped his cabinet so as to make it an even more thoroughgoing agency of the conservative parties.[16] One week later, SCAP directed the Prime Minister to prepare for a general election "as soon as practicable after the close of the present session of the Diet." Leftist political forces, sullen because the conservatives had seemed entrenched in power and because SCAP had forbidden the general strike, hailed with approval the call for a new election.

[14] See D. N. Rowe, "The New Japanese Constitution, I," *Far Eastern Survey*, Jan. 27, 1947. Cited in H. S. Quigley, "Japan's Constitutions: 1890 and 1947," *op. cit.*

[15] The *Nippon Times* stated that some 500,000 people participated in the Tokyo demonstration. The writer was in Tokyo at the time and doubts that there were as many as 200,000 participants. Another huge anti-cabinet demonstration was staged on Jan. 28, 1947.

[16] Coalition talk continued even after Yoshida's reshuffle of Jan. 31.

The politicians on the left, however, were angered and dismayed by the government-sponsored revision of the election law. The law had provided for large electoral districts in which the electorate was to vote for several candidates. The conservatives, shortly before the election, proposed a change to smaller districts, with fewer representatives, with each voter casting his ballot for only a single candidate. Said the *Nippon Times* editorially: " . . . it is . . . obvious that . . . a change at this time will markedly favor the conservatives and hamper the liberals . . . ."[17] In spite of strenous opposition from the Socialists and other opposition groups, Government parties were able to push through their own plans for revision.

In the campaign, Socialists used the allegedly unfair election law revision as a campaign weapon. Their party demanded, among other things, state control of the coal, iron and steel, and fertilizer industries, preparatory to state ownership. Doubtless, however, the real power of the Socialists lay in the electorate's discontent with the *status quo*, part of which was the Yoshida government. This last factor was probably most influential in producing the unexpected show of Socialist strength on April 25,[18] when the *Shakaito*, by electing 143 members of the House of Representatives, became the leading political party in that House. It is obviously significant that Socialist power proved so formidable in spite of an election law rigged to favor conservative interests.

The Shakaito in Power: May, 1947–February, 1948. Since the Socialists had emerged from the election as the plurality party, their representation in the new cabinet was generally conceded to be inevitable, though there was some question of the *Shakaito's* future rôle because the Liberal and the Democratic parties—the conservatives of Japanese politics—controlled a majority of Diet seats. Negotiations among the parties for formation of a new cabinet began shortly after the April 25 election and continued for more than a month. During these talks, Socialists showed themselves amazingly conciliatory: they did not insist on the premiership; they watered down their proposal for state control of key industries; they acceded to the Liberals' demand that no attempts be made to freeze the "new yen" or to stop interest payments on war bonds; they offered to exclude their left-wing members from cabinet posts. Until nearly the end of May, it appeared fairly certain that the new Government would be headed by a Socialist premier, but that all of Japan's major parties would participate in formation of a national coalition. But the Liberals, after

[17] *Nippon Times*, Mar. 23, 1947.

[18] Four elections were held in Japan in Apr., 1947: on Apr. 5, for the heads of local self-governing bodies; on Apr. 20, for members of the House of Councillors; on Apr. 25, for the House of Representatives; and on Apr. 30, for local assemblymen. Space limitations preclude analysis of Socialist strength in these several contests.

having formally promised their coöperation, and after having entered into an agreement on policy, suddenly and belatedly announced that they could not coöperate with the Socialists unless the *Shakaito* purged itself of all left-wing elements. Socialists obviously could not accept this demand, which would have meant disintegration of their party. Instead, the Socialists, the Democrats, and the Peoples' Coöperatives established a coalition government without the Liberals.[19]

The new Government was headed by Socialist Katayama Tetsu, who had been elected chairman of his party's central executive committee in the fall of 1946.[20] Katayama, born in Wakayama prefecture in 1887, was graduated in 1912 from Tokyo Imperial University as a specialist in German law. During his first years after graduation, he practiced law with his father in Wakayama. In 1919, he opened a legal consultant's office in Tokyo, specializing in labor cases. Since that time he has been active in various phases of the labor movement. Katayama has been prominent, too, in educational and religious fields. From 1920 until 1930, he was a lecturer at Tokyo Women's University—a Christian, American-supported, institution. Katayama is the author of several books: *Laws Relating to Women, Laws Protective of Mother and Child, A Practical Guide for Retirement Savings,* and *An Outline of Civil Arbitration.* Katayama was elected to the Diet three times during the 1930's. He remained there until the Tojo-managed election of 1942, though he had previously been ousted from the Social Mass party for opposing the expulsion of Saito Takao from the Diet in 1940. During the war, he retired from politics and devoted himself to the practice of law.

Katayama is not a dynamic personality; he has not proved himself an aggressive leader; he is not an astute politician. He is a Christian gentleman of broad tolerance, some vision, and unquestioned honesty. In spite of his right-wing Socialist sympathies, Katayama is respected by the leftists of his own party. His integrity and tolerance—not his political skill or acumen—have been significant factors in holding together the diverse constituents of the Socialist party.

Katayama's chief political adviser, and probably the Socialists' most capable politician, is Nishio Suehiro, who entered the Government as minister without portfolio and chief cabinet secretary. Unlike Katayama, Nishio has no academic background. He had no formal education beyond

[19] The cabinet thus formed included 6 Social Democrats, 7 Democrats, 2 People's Coöperatives, and 1 Independent.

[20] Many Socialists, particularly left-wingers, had hoped that Oyama Ikuo, former university professor who had founded a proletarian party in the late 1920's, and who, under pressure from the militarists, had fled to the United States in the early 1930's, could return to Japan to assume leadership of the Socialist movement. But Oyama's return was delayed until October, 1947. Since then he has not taken an ostensibly active rôle in politics.

primary school, but has came up through the rough and tumble of union politics. Nishio frankly represents the right-wing point of view;[21] he is a compromiser, a skillful handler of men. His practicality and Katayama's idealism have constituted an effective combination.

The first Socialist-led government in Japan's history began its tour of duty with some strength and much weakness: the Socialists enjoyed considerable public prestige; but they found themselves responsible for a Government the policies of which they could not in effect control; further, their chief coalition partner was an unsteady teammate—the Democrats were sorely divided on the question of coöperation with the Socialists; also, the *Shakaito's* ministers were men without significant administrative experience; and, always lurking in the background, was the disunity of the Socialists themselves; the left wing was a loose plank in the coalition platform.[22]

The first Socialist government faced many and diverse problems, but none consumed more time, produced more political wrangling, or better symbolized the weakness of the coalition government than the attempt to increase coal production through some method of government control. The Socialists were, in principle, committed to nationalization, but they had estopped themselves from urging its application in order to fabricate a cabinet. However, immediately after the formation of the Katayama cabinet, Socialist Mizutani Chozaburo, minister of commerce and industry, stated that the Socialists would bring the coal industry under state control regardless of the Democrats' attitude. After a summer of wrangling, and extensive Socialist concessions, a government draft was decided upon in August. Mine-owners' opposition forced further amendment of this draft. In mid-September, the cabinet approved a draft bill, though its name was changed from "Temporary Coal-Mining State Control Bill" to "Temporary Coal-Mining Control Bill." Later in September, the bill was referred to the Mining Committee of the House of Representatives. This committee, though dominated by Government party men, never approved the bill, since a segment of the Democrats were violently opposed even to the mild measure to which the Socialists had by now consented. Eventually the measure reached the floor of the House and was passed on November 25. Councillors' approval came in early December.

The final measure obviously was satisfactory to no one, although the

[21] No Socialist left-wingers were included in the cabinet, although Suzuki Mozaburo was talked about as a possible finance minister and Kato Kanju as welfare minister. The conservative parties insisted on left-wing exclusion as a condition of participation in the coalition.

[22] For a criticism of the coalition from the left-wing viewpoint, see Suzuki Tomin, "The Japan Social Democratic Party and the German Social Democratic Party," in *Jinmin Sensen* (*People's Front*), Aug., 1947. A digest of this article appears in *The Japan Review* for Sept. 5, 1947.

Socialists apparently believed that they had "saved face" by enactment of any sort of coal control measure; and the Democrats, although the issue had split their party, could claim that they had successfully resisted real nationalization. It is possible, however, that the debates on the subject constituted a valuable educative process for Japanese politicians, many of whom are traditionally more interested in following a leader than in formulating policy. The Coal Control bill brought the conflict of ideologies into the realm of practical politics. Left-wingers were shown the difficulty of translating theory into practice; right-wingers were shown the limits of compromise.

The dilatory tactics connected with enactment of this weak coal control measure gave the Japanese public what seemed striking evidence of Socialist ineffectiveness. Added to this were the ever-present food shortage, an aggravated inflation, and an unsatisfactory wage-price relationship. These factors together contributed to the coalition government's declining prestige, which was reflected in various public opinion surveys conducted in the fall of 1947.[23] Even labor, the Socialists' main strength, grew restive.[24]

Closely connected with the waning of the Socialist vogue was a revival of intense intra-party antagonism which was more involved than the usual left-wing–right-wing quarrels. Hirano Rikizo, agriculture and forestry minister, and chairman of his party's campaign activities in the post-war elections, was piqued because Nishio and Katayama seemed to be siding with Wada Hiroo, director-general of the Economic Stabilization Board, rather than with himself, on certain technical economic decisions. Hirano's enormous and sensitive ego was wounded by this and, in all probability also, by Nishio's prominence as the generally-recognized effective power behind Katayama. Hirano also believed that Nishio had not taken a strong enough stand toward the left-wing members of the party.[25] Thus Hirano, dissatisfied with his position within the party and sensing declining fortune for the Katayama cabinet, undertook to plan for a new party alignment, and was even suspected of flirting with the Liberals. Socialist cabinet members, probably led by Nishio, charging disloyalty,

[23] See *Nippon Times* editorial of Nov. 29, 1947.

[24] The *Nippon Times* of Nov. 14, 1947, reported the warning given by Kan Makoto of the NCIO (National Congress of Industrial Organizations), on November 12, to 100,000 union members assembled in the Imperial Plaza. Kan stated that labor had previously gathered in the plaza to support the Katayama cabinet, but that if conditions did not improve, a mass meeting for the cabinet's overthrow might sometime be necessary.

[25] Hirano formed his own National Farmers' Union in July, 1947, after having seceded from the Japan Farmers' Union in February because he felt the latter to be under Communist dominance. After his purge, Hirano's strongest Diet supporters formed their own political party.

ousted Hirano from his post as agriculture and forestry minister and thereby alienated those right-wing Socialists closely associated with Hirano in the National Farmers' Union.

The situation was further complicated because at the time of Hirano's dismissal his disloyalty to the cabinet was confused with the issue of his possible purge, which did materialize somewhat later.[26] Consequently the Katayama government was placed on the defensive, since it appeared that the cabinet might be using the purge as a political weapon. The cabinet never recovered from the effects of the Hirano purge, which set off a chain reaction that shortly led to the Government's fall. With Hirano out of the cabinet, left-wingers sought to turn the situation to their advantage by securing appointment of a thoroughgoing left-wing minister of agriculture and forestry. This, however, was made impossible by the strong opposition of coalition partners who charged that such an appointment would run counter to the four-party agreement concluded at the time of the formation of the cabinet.

The left wing, incensed by this defeat, grew increasingly restive, increasingly influential in party councils, partly perhaps because, with Hirano gone, skillful Nishio could no longer play off right-wing elements against the left.[27] In any event, at the Socialists' National Convention held in mid-January, 1948, the right wing, though it was able to maintain its hold on party offices, suffered a resounding defeat when the left wing pushed through abrogation of the four-party agreement and thus committed the Socialists to a thoroughgoing Socialist policy regardless of consequences for the coalition.

Left-wingers did not wait long for another test of strength. They stoutly opposed a provision of the supplementary budget providing for increased railway and postal rates, said to have been demanded by SCAP.[28] Such increases were certain to be unpopular among labor elements, and it at first seemed likely that the left-wing Socialists were simply making a political play in order to hold labor's support. Most circles were considerably surprised, consequently, when the left-wing leaders held firm on this relatively minor issue and by so doing brought the collapse, on February 9, 1948, of Japan's first Socialist-led government. It is likely that the politically naïve left wing, while certainly recognizing the potentialities of

[26] The Hirano purge case was long drawn out and involved, particularly because Hirano, refusing to accept the decision of the Central Screening Committee, filed a law suit against the Committee. When the Tokyo District Court issued an injunction against the government and the Committee, ordering that Hirano be not purged, the Japanese Supreme Court issued a reversal of the District Court's action, though indicating clearly, by quoting a SCAP statement, that its action was the result of pressure from Allied Headquarters.

[27] *Nippon Times*, Jan. 10, 1948.

[28] *New York Times*, Feb. 15, 1948.

its action, staked its policy on a mistaken belief in the probability of compromise.

Conclusion. The Socialist party which emerged from the political reshuffle following Japan's surrender was a medley of political forces brought together by varying motives. These diverse origins have been reflected in an intense intra-party cleavage—between the perhaps overly "practical" right wing and the honest but politically naïve left wing—which has seriously weakened Socialist effectiveness, whether the party was in or out of office.

The Socialists' popularity gained rapid momentum, not because Japan's masses believed in Socialism or had real confidence in Socialist leaders, but rather because conservative forces had been tried and found wanting. As a result, the Socialists were saddled with responsibility before their leaders were prepared for it, and probably before significant economic revival was possible, regardless of the capabilities of the country's leaders.

The Socialists have failed to build a well-knit or politically-efficient organization; they have failed to agree on a well-thought-out practical program with which to meet Japan's pressing problems. The party had, however, served as the political agent for the bulk of Japanese labor, and in so doing may have prevented labor forces from affiliating with the farther left. It is to be hoped, although present circumstances seem to offer little basis for optimism, that in future the *Shakaito*, by sloughing off its incompatible elements on the right and the left, will serve as a rallying point for all Japan's truly Socialist forces and thus contribute to the development of a party system based on principles rather than on leaders or expediency.

NEWS AND NOTES

PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

Compiled by the Managing Editor

The forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association will be held at the Palmer House in Chicago on December 28, 29, and 30. An effort has been made this year to reduce the number of conflicting meetings and to focus attention on major problems without overlooking desires of members to meet in smaller as well as larger groups. Emphasis has been placed on world problems and on the activities, methods, and techniques of political science. A general session on the presidential election of 1948 will open the program on Tuesday morning, December 28. Five open conferences have been scheduled for each of the two afternoons of December 28 and 29, and eight round tables will meet on each of the two mornings of December 29 and 30. Two or three luncheons will be addressed by prominent speakers, and an evening meeting is scheduled for the evening of the 29th, in addition to the evening meeting on the 28th at which the presidential address will be given. The following subjects will be dealt with in round tables or open conferences: New Trends in the Conduct of American Foreign Policy; The Problem of Civil Rights in America; International Problems of the Far East; The Problem of Executive Reorganization; Political Theory; Southeast Asia; The Polarization of World Power; An Appraisal of the Inter-American System; Anniversaries, 1848–1948; The Governments of Satellite States; The Political Scientist and Practical Politics; Measurement and Statistical Studies of Government and Politics; Methods of Teaching; As Others See Us; Public Law; Comparative Government; The Impact of Foreign Commitments on Administrative Organization; Local and Municipal Problems; State Legislatures; Political Behavior; Intergovernmental Relations; New Developments in Political Science; Labor-Management Relations in the Public Service; Business and Government; and The Rôle of the Political Scientist in Adult Education. A preliminary program giving the detailed arrangements is in the hands of the Secretary-Treasurer and will be distributed to the members of the Association in the near future.—JAMES K. POLLOCK, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM.

Dr. Charles A. Beard, president of the American Political Science Association in 1926, author of some thirty books on history and government, and long a leading figure in American scholarship, died in Grace-New Haven Community Hospital, at New Haven, Connecticut, on September 1 at the age of seventy-three. A suitable memorial will appear in the next issue of the REVIEW.

Professor Harvey Walker, of Ohio State University, secretary-treasurer of the American Political Science Association, received the degree of LL.B. from Ohio State University in June and in August was admitted to the Ohio Bar.

Dean Paul H. Appleby, of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, attended a seminar on integration of the Social Sciences held at the College of Social Science, University of Puerto Rico, from June 14 to July 30.

During the current year, Professor W. Hardy Wickwar is on leave from Hamilton College for service as a Social Affairs officer of the United Nations. He was on duty during the recent meeting of the General Assembly in Paris.

Dr. T. V. Smith, formerly professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, has been appointed professor of citizenship and philosophy at Syracuse University and began his teaching duties this fall, conducting a new course entitled "The Theory and Practice of Democracy," sharing in a course, "Ethics and Social Science," offered jointly by the department of political science and philosophy, and teaching also in the department of English.

Dr. Robert Oxnam has been appointed assistant dean of the College of Liberal Arts and assistant professor of political science at Syracuse University. He received his bachelor's degree at DePauw University and his master's and doctor's degrees at the University of Southern California.

At Syracuse University, Dr. Alfred H. Cope has been appointed assistant professor of citizenship and assistant director of the Citizenship Program and Dr. Martin B. Travis, Jr., assistant professor of international relations.

Dr. Peter H. Odegard has resigned the presidency of Reed College to accept appointment as chairman of the department of political science at the University of California (Berkeley).

Professor Hans Kelsen, of the University of California (Berkeley), participated in the program of the annual meeting of the American Society of International Law at the University of Washington in August. He is taking sabbatical leave (in residence) for the fall semester to complete work on a manuscript.

Professor Norman J. Padelford, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was called back to the Department of State during the past summer as consultant in the office of the Assistant Secretary of State for Transport and Communication Policy.

Dr. Theodore W. Cousens has been appointed to an associate professorship at Bucknell University.

Professor Edward G. Lewis, of the University of Texas, has accepted an associate professorship at the University of Illinois, where he has taken over the work in British and European government.

Dr. John H. Herz, from 1943 to 1948 associated with the Office of Strategic Services and the Department of State, has been appointed professor of international law and relations at Howard University.

Professor Lee S. Greene, of the University of Tennessee, taught at the University of Alabama during the second term of the recent summer session.

Dr. Max M. Kampelman, formerly a member of the political science department at the University of Minnesota, has joined the faculty of Bennington College, Bennington, Vermont.

Dr. Victor Thompson, assistant professor at the Illinois Institute of Technology, served as consultant to the National Security Resources Board during the summer months.

Miss Sonya Forthal is serving as interim professor of political science at Aurora College, Aurora, Illinois.

At the University of Minnesota, Dr. Asher N. Christensen has been advanced to a full professorship and Dr. Werner Levi to an associate professorship.

Mr. Thomas Page, instructor in political science and research associate with the University of Kansas bureau of government research, has resigned to resume his graduate study at the University of Minnesota.

Mr. Fredryc R. Darby, recently a member of the faculty of Vassar College, has accepted appointment as lecturer in political science for the fall semester at the University of California (Berkeley).

Dr. George A. Lipsky has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor at the University of California (Berkeley).

Professor Dwight Waldo, of the University of California (Berkeley), taught during the summer at San Francisco State College.

Professor Robert R. Benedict, of Boston University, spent the summer in England studying recent developments in European governments.

Dr. James Drury, who received his doctorate from Princeton University, has been advanced from instructor to assistant professor at the University of Kansas.

Dr. Francis Heller, of the University of Virginia, has been appointed assistant professor at the University of Kansas and will teach principally in the field of public law.

Messrs. Lowell Noonan and Robert Warren Tucker, former teaching assistants at the University of California (Berkeley), have accepted instructorships at Pennsylvania State College and Washington State College, respectively.

After a summer of research in Mexico, Mr. Wendell Schaeffer, until recently senior teaching assistant in political science at the University of California (Berkeley), has joined the faculty of the University of Florida as assistant professor.

Professor N. Wing Mah, on sabbatical leave for the fall semester from the University of California (Berkeley), has gone to China for observation and study.

Mr. Emile Ader, recently teaching assistant at the University of California (Berkeley), has accepted appointment as assistant professor at the University of Tulsa.

Dr. Herman H. Trachsel, of the State University of Iowa, has accepted a position as professor and head of the department of political science at the University of Wyoming, beginning September 1, 1948.

Since April, Professor Charles Aikin has been on leave from the University of California (Berkeley) and serving as assistant to Dean G. Acheson, vice-chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. He will continue with the Commission until its report is submitted in January, 1949.

Mr. Max Beloff, reader in comparative institutions at Oxford University, lectured during the summer session at the University of Minnesota on the topic, "British Foreign Policy Today," and Dr. Alfred de Grazia on "Scientific Difficulties in the Concept of the Majority."

At the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, Professor Alpheus Mason, of Princeton University, gave three lectures on July 26–28 on "Liberalism Enters the Crucial Phase."

Miss Ruth Roettinger, assistant professor of government, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina, is one of five persons appointed by Governor J. Strom Thurmond to a committee of twenty-one created by the South Carolina legislature to make a study of the existing constitution and constitutional needs of the state.

Dr. Paul G. Steinbicker, chairman of the department of government at St. Louis University, has been reappointed by Governor Phil M. Donnelly

to a six-year term on the Missouri Personnel Advisory Board. The Board has jurisdiction over the state merit system prescribed in the new constitution of 1945, and covering about 6,500 of the state's 11,000 employees.

During the past summer, Mr. Irwin M. Tobin, of the U. S. Department of State, served as educational director of the Institute of World Affairs held at Twin Lakes, Salisbury, Connecticut. This institute runs for six weeks each summer and offers opportunity for relatively advanced American students to come into contact with foreign students and with stimulating lecturers in an informal academic atmosphere. Persons who have in mind possible candidates for scholarships in 1949 may communicate with the Institute's headquarters at 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Dr. Harold R. Enslow is on leave from his regular work as director of training for the Division of Placement and Unemployment Insurance of the New York State Department of Labor and is making a special study for the New York State Education Department of certification of public accountants.

At Beloit College, Mr. Harry R. Davis, who has been doing graduate work at the University of Chicago, has been appointed to an instructorship and Dr. William S. Shepherd has been advanced to the rank of associate professor.

Professor Leo Gross, of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, will serve as visiting lecturer in international relations at Yale University during the coming spring term.

Professor Harold W. Davey has resigned his position at New York University to accept a professorship at Iowa State College. He will be teaching primarily in the general field of labor.

Dr. Mary Earhart Dillon has severed her connection with Northwestern University to accept an associate professorship at Queens College.

As a visiting lecturer from the University of Wales and Balliol College, Oxford University, Mr. Gordon K. Lewis is teaching during the current year at the University of Chicago.

At Dickinson College, Dr. Chester E. Jarvis has been promoted to an assistant professorship.

Dr. Albert C. F. Westphal, of the University of New Mexico, was recently made a member of the executive council of the American Society of International Law with a term ending in 1951.

During the summer of 1948, Professor Spencer Albright, of the University of Richmond, taught at the University of South Dakota during the first term and at the University of Arkansas during the second term.

During the current academic year, Dr. Gerhard Krebs, formerly of Western Reserve University, is serving as visiting professor at the University of Nebraska and teaching courses in political theory.

Professor Egbert S. Wengert, formerly head of the political science department at the University of Wyoming, has accepted a similar position at the University of Oregon. During August, he was in Washington, D. C. in his capacity of consultant to the National Resources Security Board.

At the University of Tulsa, Mr. Emile B. Ader, recently a teaching assistant at the University of California, has been appointed assistant professor. In addition to American government, Professor Ader will offer courses in international relations and political theory.

At Western Reserve University, Dr. William C. Rogers, of the University of Virginia, has been appointed associate professor in charge of the work in international relations, and Mr. James R. Watson, for the past three years director of the public administration training program at the University of Puerto Rico, has been appointed to a similar post to head a program of training for the public service.

At the University of California at Los Angeles, Professor Frank M. Stewart has resigned the directorship of the bureau of governmental research, which he has held since 1937, to give full time to duties in the department of political science. Professor Winston W. Crouch has been appointed his successor, effective July 1. Professor Crouch also has been appointed by the Los Angeles county board of supervisors a member of the county civil service commission. Los Angeles county adopted the merit system by county charter in 1913.

From part-time instructorships at the University of Minnesota, Miss Janice Christensen has been appointed instructor at the University of Texas; Miss Hattie Kawahara, instructor at Wayne University; Mr. Robert Fluno, assistant professor at Mount Union College; and Mr. Ivan Hinderaker, assistant professor at the University of California (Los Angeles). Mr. Rozendo Gomez, research fellow in intergovernmental relations, has been appointed instructor at the University of Arizona.

Recent appointments in the international relations division at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology include Messrs. James E. Boyce, Douglas J. Frontein, and John L. Rawlinson, formerly of the United States Foreign Service, as instructors. Dr. Pauline Tompkins has been appointed associate editor of *Current Readings on International Relations*, published twice a year by the Institute.

Professor Robert J. Harris, of Louisiana State University, served as visiting professor at the University of North Carolina during the second

half of the recent summer session, and Professor Walter H. Bennett, of the University of Alabama and Mr. James W. Prothro, graduate student at Princeton University, taught at Louisiana State.

Assistant Professor Nelson E. Taylor, Jr., of Tufts College, has accepted a post carrying similar rank at Louisiana State University, and Mr. Peter J. Fliess, graduate student at Harvard University, has been appointed also to an assistant professorship.

Dr. Walter T. Bogart, chairman of the department of political science at Middlebury College, has been promoted to a full professorship; Dr. C. Leonard Hoag, to an associate professorship; and Mr. Harris E. Thurber has been reappointed instructor for an additional year.

Dr. John Day Larkin, dean of liberal studies at Illinois Institute of Technology, has been serving as arbitrator of labor disputes in the Chicago area since the termination of the NWLB. He is currently a member of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service's panel of arbitrators, and serves on the Labor Panel of the American Arbitration Association.

Professor Herbert A. Simon, chairman of the department of political and social science at Illinois Institute of Technology, spent the summer in Washington, D. C., as acting chief, Management Engineering Branch, Organization and Management Division of the Economic Coöperation Administration.

Dr. Robert Mowitz, formerly at Syracuse University, has been appointed instructor in the department of government at Wayne University.

Professor Grayson L. Kirk, of Columbia University, taught at the University of California (Berkeley) during the recent summer session and offered courses on Basic Factors in International Relations and Contemporary Problems in International Relations. Professor Vernon Van Dyke, of Yale University, served as a member of the summer session staff at the same institution.

Mr. Edgar J. Davies, instructor at Louisiana State University, while completing a study of special districts in Louisiana, will devote all of his time during 1948-49 to the bureau of government research.

Dr. Charles S. Ascher is completing service as executive officer, Office of the Director General, UNESCO, to enter upon his new duties as professor of political science and chairman of the department at Brooklyn College at the beginning of 1949.

Professor James E. Pate, of the College of William and Mary, and research adviser to the Lower Peninsula Planning Commission's consolida-

tion study committee, has prepared a report on structure and services, with plans for consolidation of the local governments of the Lower Peninsula area, which the committee is now considering. As chairman of the Williamsburg Planning Commission, Professor Pate assisted in drafting a zoning ordinance which the city council has adopted as part of the city's master plan now in progress.

During the past summer, Professor Karl Loewenstein, of Amherst College, served with U. S. Military Government in Berlin, engaged in legal work. During the summer also, Professor Benjamin Ziegler, of Amherst, gave courses at Tufts College.

Professor Earl Latham, of the University of Minnesota, has accepted appointment at Amherst College as the first Joseph B. Eastman Professor of Political Science. The Joseph B. Eastman chair of political science is supported by the endowment of the Joseph B. Eastman Foundation at Amherst, established in 1944 as a memorial to the late public servant and administered by the trustees of the College with a view to increasing student interest in careers in the public service. During the summer, Professor Latham served as a consultant to the United Nations at Lake Success, Washington, Montreal, and Ottawa.

Dr. Ralph R. Temple, a member of the American Political Science Association's committee on judicial organization and administration, was engaged during the past summer, at the request of Chief Justice-Designate Arthur T. Vanderbilt, in organizing the offices of the clerk of the supreme court, the clerk of the superior court, and the administrative director, under the constitution and rules lately adopted in New Jersey. In 1942 and 1947, Dr. Temple made official administrative surveys of the constitutional courts in that state.

While on sabbatical leave from New York University during the first semester of the current year, Professor Rinehart J. Swenson is devoting part of his time to the completion of a manuscript. During Professor Swenson's absence, Professor Ray F. Harvey is in charge of the department. Dr. Theodore H. Skinner has been promoted to an associate professorship and Dr. Albert Somit to an assistant professorship.

At Miami University (Ohio), Dr. Warren Cunningham has been promoted to an associate professorship; Mr. Louis H. Douglas has been granted a semester's leave to complete residence requirements for the doctorate at Yale University; Mr. Alan C. Rankin has been given leave to assist in the reorganization of the Japanese civil service; and Messrs. James R. Woodworth and William K. Metcalfe have been appointed in-

structors. Professor-emeritus Burton L. French, now with the U. S. Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Board of Review, was given the honorary degree of LL.D. at Miami's June commencement.

Dr. Robert A. Walker has resigned as director of the Institute of Citizenship at Kansas State College to accept the post of assistant director of the Foreign Service Institute in the Department of State. He will be in charge of the School of Management and Administrative Training in the Institute, which is responsible for in-service training in these areas for the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Succeeding Dr. Walker, Mr. Carl Tjerandsen, formerly associate director, has been appointed director of the Institute of Citizenship at Kansas State, and Dr. Earl E. Edgar will serve as associate director.

Graduates of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in 1948 have accepted teaching appointments (as instructor unless otherwise indicated) as follows: Whitney T. Perkins, assistant professor, University of Denver; George A. Carroll, professor, Case Technical Institute; Pauline F Tompkins, lecturer, Wellesley College; Mrs. Janet Norwood, Wellesley College; Guy E. Horsley, assistant professor, Washington and Jefferson College; North C. Burn, Washington and Jefferson College; Robert E. Lorish, Muhlenberg College; Gregory B. Wolfe, Pomona College; Jonathan D. Stoddart, George Washington University; Philip L. Bridgham, University of Hawaii; Austin Peck, University of Maine; Joseph E. Devlin, Jr., Allegheny College; and E. Leigh Sawyer, University of Connecticut.

At Rutgers University, Mr. Ardath W. Burks, formerly of the School of Advanced International Studies, has been appointed assistant professor in charge of courses on international affairs. Professor Bennett M. Rich served last spring as research consultant to the New Jersey Civil Liberties Committee, and during the summer as staff member, Civil Administration Division, Office of Military Government, in Germany. During the earlier summer, Professor John J. George was on exchange with Professor Carl M. Frasure, of West Virginia University, and later served as visiting professor at Pennsylvania State College.

Dr. M. H. Satterfield, head budget analyst of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been appointed professor of political science at Vanderbilt University, at which institution he served as visiting professor during the 1948 spring quarter. In addition to teaching courses in regional and local government and public administration, Dr. Satterfield will serve as acting head of the department during the absence of Professer D. F. Fleming. Dr. Satterfield has been with TVA over twelve years, first as a member of the Government Research Staff and more recently of the Budget Staff.

The Walter J. Shepard annual lecture at Ohio State University was delivered on April 28 by President Peter H. Odegard of Reed College, now professor of political science at the University of California (Berkeley). His subject was "Frontiers of Freedom; An Inquiry into the Foundations of Western Civilization." A printed copy of the lecture may be had gratis on application to the Ohio State University department of political science.

During his current year on sabbatical leave from the University of California (Los Angeles), Professor H. Arthur Steiner is maintaining residence in central China, where he is continuing his research in Chinese government and politics. Professor Steiner was chosen one of the first Fulbright research scholars by the President's Board of Foreign Scholarships, and has received an additional grant from the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships of the Social Science Research Council. He will also serve as visiting lecturer at Cheng Chi National University in Nanking (formerly the Central Political Institute), where he will deliver a series of lectures this fall on "The United Nations—Theory and Practice." While in China, he may be addressed through the United States Educational Foundation in China, American Embassy, A.P.O. 909, San Francisco, California.

At Boston University, Professor Don B. Leffler has resigned as chairman of the department of government and director of the bureau of public administration to accept a professorship at San Diego College, California, and has been succeeded in both capacities by Professor Lashley G. Harvey. Dr. John E. Brigante, lately of Princeton University, has been appointed assistant professor, and Mr. Stephen E. Schaner, of Cornell University, has been appointed instructor. Mr. Minos Generales will be in charge of the course on Latin American government and politics in the Institute for Regional Studies (Latin America), formerly in charge of the late Gasper G. Bacon.

The following members of the political science department at the University of Chicago are participating in a lecture series this fall entitled "The American Presidency" and offered to the general public under the auspices of University College: Messrs. Merriam, Tugwell, Brownlow, Pritchett, Price, and Morgenthau.

Middlebury College has instituted a special major in American civilization designed to meet the needs of students who desire during their college course to acquire a broad and comprehensive knowledge of the history, institutions, and culture of their country rather than to specialize in any particular department. The major is sponsored jointly by the departments of American literature, history, and political science.

A leaflet listing "Census Bureau Publications on Governments" has been issued by the Bureau of the Census and is available from that agency upon request. This bulletin describes briefly each of the eighteen reports on governmental finances and employment which the Bureau expects to issue in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, and lists other recent publications of the Bureau regarding state and local governments.

A new organization to be known as the American Council on Japan has been established under the sponsorship of a group of eminent persons, nearly all of whom have had long experience with the country. Messrs. Joseph C. Grew and William R. Castle, both former American ambassadors to Japan, are honorary chairmen, and an organizing committee has established headquarters at 55 Liberty St., New York City. Study committees are to be set up, and a digest or magazine will be published.

The 1948 conference of the Governmental Research Association was held in Chicago September 8-11, with headquarters at the Congress Hotel. Principal topics for full-length meetings were "Community Development Councils and Governmental Research," "Citizen Agency Financing," "Problems in the Field of Public Welfare," "Current Developments in Governmental Research," "University Preparation for Governmental Research," "How Can Our Municipalities Best Be Financed," and "The Current Status of American Public Education."

Fellowships for graduate research and training at the Institute of Public Administration in New York City have been awarded to the following persons: Matthew J. Cullen, Jr., of Boston; Paul M. Douglas of Princeton; Val C. Mogensen of New Orleans; John R. Moot of Buffalo; Jane Eleanor Rinck of Glen Ridge, New Jersey; and George B. Toulmin of Mobile, Alabama. The six appointees were selected on the basis of their qualifications for careers in public administration and governmental research from among thirty-five nominees recommended by leading scholars and executives in these fields.

Four men who recently received their doctorates at Syracuse University have accepted teaching positions elsewhere. Dr. Glendon Schubert has been appointed assistant professor at the University of California (Los Angeles); Dr. Robert Mowitz has accepted a similar position at Wayne University; and Drs. John Hall and Robert Powers have become assistant professors at Oklahoma A. & M. In addition, three candidates for the doctorate have been appointed instructors elsewhere: Mr. Donald Herzberg, at Wesleyan University; Mr. Louis Menand, at Vassar College; and Mr. Brinley Lewis, at Colorado College. In addition, Lieut. Colonel Clarence Clapsaddle, who lately received a master's degree at Syracuse,

has been engaged to teach at the United States Military Academy at West Point.

The tentative program of the second annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, to be held at Denver on November 26-27, provides for round tables and leaders as follows: "International Law and Relations," F. B. Shick, University of Utah; "The 1948 Elections," Boyd A. Martin, University of Idaho; "Political Science and the Community," Troy R. Westmeyer, University of Denver; "The Colleges and Public Service," C. L. Edwards, U. S. Civil Service Commission; "Problems in Modern Constitutionalism," Francis D. Wormuth, University of Utah; "Natural Resources and Public Administration in the Western States," H. Byron Mock, Bureau of Land Management, U. S. Department of the Interior; "The Task of the Western Political Scientists," Egbert S. Wengert, University of Oregon; and "The American Rôle in the Pacific Area," Floyd Cave, San Francisco State College.

The second annual Institute of Teachers of Government and Administration, sponsored by the School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs of the American University, with collaboration of the Washington Chapter of the American Political Science Association, was held during the period June 13-26, with some twenty teachers of political science in attendance, and is reported to have been very successful. The Institute's objective is to provide for teachers of government and administration an opportunity to hear and confer with leaders in the national scene concerning currently vital topics and to explore at first hand the nature and sources of federal documentary materials. A copy of the administrative report on the Institute's second session may be had from the director, Dr. Lowell H. Hattery, or from Mrs. Catherine Seckler-Hudson, both of the American University.

Announcement was made recently of the founding and commencement of operations of the Shinner Political Economy Research Foundation which will specialize on problems of monopoly and business-government relations with a view to guarding against depressions and strengthening the competitive system. Research will emphasize both the economic and the governmental aspects of these problems. The founder of the new institution is Mr. Ernest G. Shinner, a Chicago business man and banker whose interest in this field stems largely from his experiences and observations during the depression of the 1930's. Mr. David Cushman Coyle has been appointed director of research; while Dr. Marshall E. Dimock as president, Mr. Shinner as vice-president, and Messrs. Stuart Chase and Estes Kefauver comprise a board of management which will later be en-

larged. Projects listed for early attention include the administration of the anti-trust laws and the relation between size and efficiency in the structure of business enterprise.

The *National Tax Journal*, a new quarterly devoted to public finance, is now being published by the National Tax Association. The quarterly, the first issue of which is dated March, 1948, replaces the *Bulletin of the National Tax Association*, which had appeared nine times a year since 1916. The *Journal* will contain articles, notes, and book reviews on phases of public finance. Manuscripts should be sent to the editor, Professor Roy Blough, of the University of Chicago, at 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Subscriptions, at $3.75 a year, should be sent to the National Tax Association, P. O. Box 1799, Sacramento 8, California.

A second Brookings Institution Seminar on Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy was held at Stanford University June 21-July 3. Like the first Seminar, held at Dartmouth College last year, this one took place under the leadership of Leo Pasvolsky, director of the International Studies Group of the Brookings Institution. It was attended by almost one hundred and fifty persons from government (including the armed services), universities, foundations, groups interested in foreign policy, and the press. Discussions, which were strictly "off the record," centered around the positions of the United States and the major powers in world affairs, great power relations in the liquidation of the war and in building a new world order, the Japanese peace settlement, economic assistance to Latin America, the veto in the United Nations, and the teaching of international relations. It is planned that the discussions, which did not attempt to reach agreed conclusions, will be reflected in the final text of the 1948 Study Guide, *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy*, and its supplementary materials. These publications of the Brookings Institution, initiated in 1947, have been of great assistance to political scientists and others interested in foreign policy, and have made a distinguished contribution to the animated discussion now going on concerning methods of teaching and research in international relations.

As part of its program of seeking to bring about a closer relation between the theory and practice of public administration, Public Administration Clearing House has defined two subjects on which it hopes to encourage more extensive research. One is "The Executive in American Democracy; His Rôle in the Development of Policy." The second is "Human Nature in Public Administration"—the general field of study on which research in administration overlaps recent studies in sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and related social sciences. In its work

in this field, the Clearing House has been consulting with an advisory committee consisting of William Anderson (University of Minnesota), Gordon R. Clapp (Tennessee Valley Authority), Rowland Egger (University of Virginia), Luther Gulick (Institute of Public Administration), Arthur W. Macmahon (Columbia University), and Leonard D. White (University of Chicago). The staff work on this program is under the supervision of Don K. Price, associate director of Public Administration Clearing House, assisted by Stephen K. Bailey, on leave from Wesleyan University; and Morton Grodzins, of the University of Chicago, is acting as consultant for the project on "Human Nature in Public Administration." The Carnegie Corporation of New York has made a special grant to support the program.

Advance Summary of Report of the Committee on Constitutional Structure of the American Political Science Association.[1] The Committee recommends that certain changes be incorporated in the constitutional structure and mode of operation of the Association in order to provide:

I. That the President be given a better opportunity to acquaint himself with and participate in carrying out the policies of the Association.

II. That the Association establish an office in Washington, D. C., for widened services to the Association, other Associations, and the public.

I.

One weakness in the constitutional plan of the American Political Science Association is found in the provisions dealing with the presidency. During the single year of his term, the President is compelled to shoulder heavy and growing responsibilities without adequate opportunity to plan for the work of his administration or to seek counsel from many of his fellow-members. To complicate the problem further, the President must make most of his important decisions early in his term of office. The Committee proposes that the man who is to serve as President shall be selected a year in advance of assuming office, and that at the close of his term as President-Designate he shall move automatically into the office of President. During his term as President-Designate, he shall serve as a member of the President's Executive Committee and participate with that committee in policy discussions. The Committee further proposes that a

[1] This report will be submitted for consideration by the Association at its annual meeting in December. To afford members an opportunity to study the proposals, the present summary has been inserted in this issue of the REVIEW after pages had been made up. *Man. Ed.*

permanent central staff of the Association be created, a staff that, among other things, will be able to serve as the Association's secretariat.

The Committee recommends that the present Executive Council be succeeded by an Executive Committee and a Council. It is recommended that the Executive Committee be composed of the President; the President-Designate; the head of the Washington office of the Association when provided; and three presidential appointees, one of whom shall be chairman of the Program Committee. It is expected that this proposed Executive Committee will meet with or otherwise be in communication with the President frequently and serve as a genuine arm of the executive, a function the existing large and scattered Executive Council cannot perform with ease. It is recommended that the legislative, electoral, and constituent powers of the existing Executive Council be transferred intact to the proposed Council. It is also recommended that this new Council be further democratized by changing it from a body of fifteen members serving for three-year terms to one of sixteen members serving for two-year terms.

The Committee recommends a number of minor constitutional changes. One calls for the abolition of the office of Assistant Secretary-Treasurer. This is merely to grant constitutional recognition to a de facto situation. Another defines in more exact language the terms of the officers of the Association, and a third makes explicit the terms of committees of the Association by providing that the term of each committee shall expire at the end of the year of its creation. One exception from this latter rule incorporated in the proposal is in the provision that in special circumstances committees may be created to serve for a period of more than the year of creation, but that in all such cases the terms of such committees shall be stated at the time of appointment. A final recommendation deals with resolutions. The suggested change is merely one requiring that the constitutional provision dealing with resolutions be brought to the attention of members of the Association prior to the annual meeting. Such a notice could be incorporated in the Preliminary Program, in the REVIEW, or in any other general mailing to members.

II.

The second major concern of the Committee was with the establishment of an Association office in Washington, D. C. It is recommended that funds be sought for such a purpose and that an adequate Washington office staff be selected. We are of the opinion that such an office could perform a variety of services for political scientists and for the nation. It would handle the general business affairs of the Association; an assistant to the editor of the REVIEW could work out of the Washington office; such an office could be instrumental in placing political scientists in active or

consultative posts in the government service; it could serve as a center for political scientists doing research in Washington and also could route information of a specialized character to especially interested members; it could serve both the government and political scientists in arranging conferences between public officials and selected members of the Association on pressing issues of public policy; and, finally, it could serve as a center to draw under the influence of the Association presently independent organizations of political scientists and could aid in coördinating the work of the Association with other social science groups working in Washington.

Limited space in the REVIEW prevents including in this note the exact wording of the proposed changes in the Constitution or a detailed statement in support of the proposal to establish an office in Washington.

WILLIAM T. R. FOX
JOHN GAUS
J. ROLAND PENNOCK
LEONARD D. WHITE
CHARLES AIKIN, *Chairman*

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Economic Security and Individual Freedom; Can We Have Both? By Albert Lauterbach. (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press. 1948. Pp. iv, 178. $2.50.)

This book is essentially a political tract, an exercise in popular semantics and persuasion. The author seeks to explain, and to rectify, the confusion of meanings into which so many politico-economic discussions descend when the general question is raised as to the responsibility of government for establishing economic security. He believes that the social goals of freedom and security are polar concepts that are reconciled in the process of planning.

In order to justify this dialectic, Mr. Lauterbach finds it necessary to cast out the Lucifer of twentieth-century devils, the attitude that society really can do nothing about the problems that produce mass insecurity. The lesson is clear from the past fifty years that society must act through government to avoid the misery of both economic depression and political oppression. Once this paradox is grasped, it follows that *laissez-faire* in any literal sense has become obscurantist utopianism. For different reasons, the communist and fascist "solutions" must be rejected for the devastating effects they produce in the form of popular irresponsibility when the people are persuaded to repose complete confidence in any single political party or ideology claiming absolute knowledge for resolving the great dilemma.

Following this brief essay in historical interpretation, the author analyzes such prescriptive labels as free enterprise, socialism, planning, social control, and the meaning of each in relation to democracy. At one early point (p. 11), he seems to say that the proper criteria for evaluating such ideas are "the comparative economic efficiency" and "social desirability" of the various systems of politico-economic organization to be analyzed. But this gesture toward logico-empirical procedure is not followed through. The line actually taken is to present a conceptual spectrum of the possible types of planning, and then to list seven methods of social control by which society at one time or another has actually used government to direct and guide economic activity. Having distinguished eight possible types of planning and not-planning, and seven methods of social control (not all being mutually exclusive), the author arrives at the position that these controls should be coördinated and applied to essential areas of public need at strategic points of policy control at the top, subject of course "to constant criticism and periodic free elections" (p. 87).

Planning is defined (pp. 63-64) as "a conscious choice of priorities by public agencies in the interest of social goals of a specific character." From this definition, says our author, it is clear that society may use any one or

a combination of all methods of social control in achieving the selected goals. From the standpoint of society, it is an incidental, though important, problem of utility and convenience as to whether public or private enterprise (mixed or separate) is to be utilized in any particular area. There is no necessary reason why the basic values of individual liberties and incentives are incompatible with the assertion of public responsibility at top policy levels. We may assume that the managerial skills of delegation and supervision, differential remuneration and advancement on the basis of meritorious accomplishment, effective worker participation and high morale, can be mobilized in the pursuit of public goals no less than for private accumulation. It is sufficient then to specify that "in selecting leaders for the control of economic life, society should follow the established processes of democracy, reinforced by a number of genuine improvements . . . such as the modernization of parliamentary procedures" (p. 117). "There are convincing reasons for believing that the Bill of Rights can be applied as easily to a society that controls its economic development as to a society that lets it run amuck" (p. 136).

The book should be read, if not for its novelty, to appreciate the full flavor of its intellectual flexibility, and for the engaging brevity with which it disposes of the sacred cows that block the application of systematic intelligence to the solution of social problems. It also provides an excellent illustration of the blind spot in much planning literature, namely, the implicit assumption that mass popular acceptance of planning awaits only the giving to the people of a chance to stand up and be counted (presumably by proportional representation) on the question of whether they wish to be governed by those who believe in the proper kind of planning.

Washington, D. C. AVERY LEISERSON.

Freedom and the Administrative State. By JOSEPH ROSENFARB. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1948. Pp. xiii, 274. $4.00.)

Mr. Rosenfarb, for nine years on the legal staff of the National Labor Relations Board and now working in labor arbitration, takes the thesis that a planned economy is inevitable in the evolution of social forces in our world, but that the United States can still choose a democratic form of administrative state with freedom preserved for individuals. By freedom, he means "the condition in which man can fulfill his capacities, his drives, and his appetites." By democracy, he means that final control of public policy should be in the hands of individuals acting in groups, although individuals will not share equally in the possession of power because a pyramid and *élite* will form in any type of state.

His presentation is divided into four books: I. The Genesis and Evo-

lution of the Administrative State, in which he takes a psycho-anthropological approach to what he sees as the evolution from individual quest for power to the necessity for planning and social control in our contemporary economy; II. Freedom and Democracy in the Administrative State, in which he argues that freedom can be served rather than dispelled in the emerging state; III. Labor Relations in the Administrative State, in which he advocates unions, democratically conducted, but thinks government must be dominant in settling disputes; and IV. Law and Government in the Administrative State, in which he suggests changes in government to make it ready for its rôle, but proposes to retain both executive and legislature and to continue free elections.

There are so many ideas in Mr. Rosenfarb's treatment that it is impossible to review them all. A selection of some of his main points will indicate the way he is thinking. He proposes some solutions to the dilemma of how to preserve democracy in the face of the historical trends brought on by technological development.

The essence of the planning which is necessary is, he thinks, to link supply with demand by direct administration by government. Based upon "accurate estimates of the desirable yearly production in each industry, . . . the government would then assign a quota of production to each producer in the industry to fill, guaranteeing him against loss if he failed to sell the product." Full employment would supply the purchasing power to absorb all products except a small margin allowed for error. The planning and control of production for the recent war would be carried into peacetime. This production was not the work of private enterprise alone, he points out, but of "private enterprise integrated by a democratic state."

To eliminate conflict between the executive in government and the legislature, as well as to provide more responsibility to the electorate, he finds the British cabinet system to be the solution. The United States might well adopt it with its mutual checks and balances on the tenure, but not on the power, of the executive and legislature. Or we might make the term of the President and that of Congress coterminous, giving the President the authority to dissolve Congress for a new election whenever disagreement became serious. The President might have a cabinet composed of his own appointees plus some appointed by Congress.

Mr. Rosenfarb draws conclusions with assurance in a most difficult field. He is dealing emphatically with a subject perplexing many earnest students who are trying to find the pattern of political evolution and to chart the future. One wishes that he showed more awareness of the complexities and more grasp of the realities to be considered. Instead, he follows a tendency to state firm, clear answers that leave a lot of questions unanswered, indeed unmentioned.

Often he resorts to the word "should," as "We should follow the British

example," and while it may be pleasant to indulge in opinions, this is too easy a way out of difficulties to merit much intellectual respect. The experienced reader will want more profound suggestions, to be offered only after wrestling with the manifold forces that operate in our world. Mr. Rosenfarb's opinions are generally interesting, but unconvincing because they are too thinly supported.

Still, the whole question of how to adjust with freedom to the administrative state is so significant that it is encouraging to see this book appear. The more discussion of the subject, the better for our understanding of this basic issue of contemporary development in government.

University of Wisconsin. JAMES L. MCCAMY.

Democracy—The Threshold of Freedom. By HAROLD F. GOSNELL. (New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1948. Pp. v, 316. $4.00.)

This volume is really two books in one. The first part deals with problems of the suffrage and the second with representation. As one might expect from Dr. Gosnell, the analyses are based on the assumption that some aspects at least of government may be made scientific and that significant hypotheses may be tested by quantitative or experimental methods. Thus Dr. Gosnell provides a mass of tremendously useful data on both topics. Not only are our own experiences drawn upon, but those of other countries as well. He discusses the extension of the suffrage to the poor, to women, and to Negroes. Age requirements, literacy tests, residence requirements, suffrage for the inhabitants of the District of Columbia, and many other pertinent issues are examined. He maintains the thesis that only when a group in a democratic country possesses suffrage can it guard its political position. He also develops the proposition, however, that suffrage is but the beginning (the threshold) or the opportunity, the use of which depends upon the individuals concerned. Such persons must learn how to employ this opportunity in order to secure their fair share of the benefits conferred by the state.

There are six chapters on representation, covering such topics as the different origins of representative assemblies, the effects of different devices of representation, the relationship of the legislator to his constituents, legislative response to political pressures, etc. Chapters on "The Representative," "The Significance of Occupation of Representatives," and "Organized Institutional Control Over Representation" are included. At the close is a chapter on "The Competence of the Voter" and one on "Democracy and Values." Consideration is given to the tools the voters have with which to perform the tasks of democracy, and to the relationship of democracy to different value patterns.

The author agrees that only the most general questions can be decided by the voters and that issues must necessarily be couched in vague lan-

guage. Nevertheless, he insists that a voter can count on sufficient information to make an intelligent choice in a modern democracy if it has universal free education, well-developed and responsible press and radio industries, well-balanced political parties, fully formed nonpartisan civic groups, and a tolerance of opposing opinions. Obviously these are big "ifs," and all of those countries which call themselves democracies fall far short of the democratic ideal.

The materials here presented are most timely and will be useful not only in introductory courses in political science, but in courses on political parties, comparative government, and international politics as well. In this period of world-wide cold conflict of ideologies, race tension, and common-man consciousness, it is well to reëxamine and reëvaluate democratic practices and democratic principles and to recognize, as the author so convincingly indicates, that the kind of order envisaged by the tenets of democracy is one based on peace, orderly methods for deciding disputes, and the brotherhood of man, regardless of color, history, physical characteristics, or early conditioning.

Ohio State University. E. ALLEN HELMS.

The Principles of Public Administration; A Study in the Mechanics of Social Action. By RICHARD WARNER (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd. 1947. Pp. viii, 212. 15s.)

This book, according to the author (p. viii), "is an attempt to survey the whole field of public administration . . . and to formulate, it is believed for the first time, a series of analytical principles by which the subject may be presented as a separate topic or discipline in the social sciences." Its approach is in interesting contrast to that followed by most American textbooks on the subject, since little emphasis is given to budgeting, personnel, organization, and the other usual topics.

The analysis is Aristotelian in its search for first principles, and the author tends to regard "public administration" as the obedient servant of the political arm of the state (Parliament). That political issues might be influenced or settled by the actions of public administrators and that ideological concepts and beliefs of persons carrying out the broad directions of the legislature might affect the end product are hardly recognized. To the author, public administration governed by his deduced principles is the mechanism of the "service state," and he deals with the problem in a framework analogous to that used in American texts on municipal administration. No doubt in part this reflects the British parliamentary system, with its coalescence of the executive and legislature. It also reflects the deep-rooted traditions of the British civil service. In contrast, the past fifteen years of American public administration of federal functions have

witnessed dynamic and often bitter struggles over policy within agencies and between agencies without particular guidance from Congress.

The heart of this book is Chapter II wherein are stated the eight principles of public administration, namely: (1) the principle of political direction, (2) the principle of public responsibility, (3) the principle of social necessity, (4) the principle of efficiency, (5) the principle of organization, (6) the principle of public relations, (7) the principle of evolution and progress, and (8) the principle of research.

Each of these principles is broken down into sub-principles which in form and style remind the reader of a legal "Hornbook." Thus under the first principle appear ten derivatives, numbered 1.01 to 1.10 respectively; the first of these, for example, reads: "1.01. Since the ends it pursues are not of its own devising, public administration serves the will of others. That will is formed and expressed by political, not by administrative, machinery." Sub-principle 4.01, under the principle of efficiency, asserts: "The transformation of one set of social conditions into another by public administration involves effort and cost, which is the 'coëfficient of social transformation' or the cost of public administration." Although the author goes to some length to distinguish his "principles" from mere "prudential rules or maxims," one is at a loss to grasp the distinctions he makes. As general propositions, however, one could hardly take issue with his principles.

In the context of these eight principles, subsequent chapters consider "Occupational Diseases and Merits of Public Administration," "Bureaucracy, Truth or Bogey," "The Control of Public Administration," "Public Administration and Private Enterprise," "The Progress of Public Administration," and "Public Opinion and Public Administration." Of these chapters, perhaps the most significant to the American reader interested in comparative administration is that on "Control of Public Administration," for it is a concise summary of British practice.

The author's style is quite readable and his combination of matter-of-fact sophistication with what appears to be naïveté of expression is at times almost entertaining. The book as a whole contains many worth-while observations on the nature and function of public administration and should be of value as reflecting a British point of view.

City College of New York. NORMAN WENGERT.

Public Opinion and Propaganda. By LEONARD W. DOOB. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1948. Pp. xxi, 600. $5.00.)

The author of this volume is professor of psychology at Yale University, and author of *Propaganda—Its Psychology and Technique,* published in 1935. During World War II, he was chief of the analysis division, Office of

the Coördinator of Inter-American Affairs; chief consulting psychologist, Military Intelligence, War Department; and policy coördinator, Overseas Branch, Office of War Information.

The first ten chapters deal with the nature and determinants of public opinion; the mechanics of public opinion polls; their social value and importance. Public opinion is defined as "people's attitudes on an issue when they are members of the same social group." The author emphasizes that opinions are derivatives of attitudes which, in turn, are products of the many factors which make individual personalities what they are. Hence, the study of public opinion is necessarily a study of human behavior. Appropriate consideration is given to such environmental factors as cultural heritage, socialization, leaders, and events; also the psychological concept of stimulus and response, personality, drives, habits, attitudes, rationalization, displacement, compensation, projection, identification, conformity, and simplification. One may accept Professor Doob's thesis that "an understanding of human behavior can provide insight into public opinion and propaganda" without being much enlightened thereby, since, as he convincingly shows, so little is known concerning individual and group behavior. Personalities, attitudes, and opinions are the products of the interaction of a multiplicity of factors. Of this we may be fairly certain. What psychology seems unable to discover, however, are the laws or principles governing the relative influence of such factors and the process of opinion formation.

Professor Doob launches a jet attack on Cantril's seventeen "laws of public opinion," only to hazard another set of "principles" as follows: (1) "Public opinion remains latent until an issue arises for the group; (2) Actual public opinion, therefore, is an attempt to diminish conflict, anxiety, and frustration; (3) Public opinion requires conformity; (4) Internal public opinion becomes external public opinion when: (a) the drive strength of the attitude is great; (b) knowledge exists that the expression of attitude in action will be rewarding rather than punishing."

Of particular interest to political scientists are the chapters on "The Evaluation of Polls" and "The Importance of Public Opinion." With reference to polls, the author concludes that "the reliability of most polls is always in doubt" (p. 144); that "the record of the very few polls whose validity has been determined by comparing the results with actual behavior is not particularly impressive" (p.149); and that "public opinion polls have contributed little or nothing to scientific theory" (p.159). The chief value of polls, in Doob's opinion, is the determination of short-range facts and the measurement of the effects of propaganda.

In discussing the age-old problem of the competence of the masses to decide questions of public policy, Professor Doob cites with approval Lippmann's views regarding the limitations of public opinion, and questions the motives of "pollsters" who, in expressing "their faith in de-

mocracy by extolling the virtues of public opinion . . . are seeking to justify their own preoccupation with the data of public opinion by emphasizing the importance of those data" (p. 200). His conclusion is: "Public opinion then, has its limitations. People can be stupid and they can be wise. Their reactions depend on their expertness, and their expertness depends on their drives and their knowledge. Experts can give better judgments about aspects of some problems, but experts cannot necessarily prescribe the good life. Over a long period of time, people decide their own fate" (p. 207).

Of the three basic problems of public opinion—how to find out what it is, how to define its rôle, and how to improve its quality—the present volume gives detailed consideration to the first, some attention to the second, and little to the third. In a sense, however, the seven chapters devoted to propaganda constitute a negative attack on the problem of quality by showing how propaganda affects the formation of opinions and distorts them. Defining propaganda as "the attempt to affect the personalities and to control the behavior of individuals toward ends considered unscientific or of doubtful value in a society at a particular time," Professor Doob uses the familiar pattern of communication analysis to consider who propagandizes what, to whom, and with what effect. Chapters are devoted to the propagandist, the content of propaganda, the audience, and media. Exceptions are taken to much of the research that is labelled content analysis. It is in connection with his examination of the audience that Doob is able to re-apply the long list of propaganda "principles" which he formulated in 1935. On the whole, the chapters on propaganda seem labored, artificial, and inconclusive. Perhaps this is inevitable when the theoretical takes the place of the historical and descriptive. The "principles" never seem to get down to a working level. Moreover, looking at the world through propaganda glasses, and seeing all forms of communication as propaganda types, seems to warp social perspectives. Propaganda needs to be seen for what it is, merely one aspect of the whole communication process. It is primarily because of the author's absorbing, virtually exclusive, preoccupation with propaganda as such that the three chapters on press, radio, and motion pictures lack completeness. These agencies are surely something more than media of propaganda in the sense in which the author defines the term propaganda. Propaganda analysis becomes sterile or misleading when it is not geared to a broad communications approach.

This is a sophisticated study. Professor Doob subjects the fields of public opinion and propaganda to penetrating analysis and criticism. He is much more keenly aware of the difficulties confronting the student of public opinion than many a pollster, journalist, and political scientist. He has admirably summarized these complexities in the final chapter, where he boldly asks: What price public opinion analysis? These complexities are of four kinds, he says: the problem of defining terms; the problem of

measurement; the problem of placing data within the framework of a consistent set of theories; and, finally, "the ogre of interaction among numerous factors." No student of government and politics can well afford to ignore the psychological foundations of his subject. If knowledge of human behavior is inadequate, it is better to face the facts than proceed as though we knew it all. Professor Doob has done a commendable service by cleaning away much accumulated under-brush of myth, fantasy, dogmatism, and muddled thinking that impedes the intelligent study of public opinion.

Princeton University. HARWOOD L. CHILDS.

Civil-Military Relationships in American Life. EDITED BY JEROME G. KERWIN. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1948. Pp. x, 181. $2.75.)

This volume consists of eight essays which present a major problem in the United States, that is, how to avoid militarism and to continue the fundamental American tradition of civilian control of governmental policy while maintaining a huge post-war military establishment with its pervasive influence not only in government, but also in science, in education, and in industry. As the United States can no longer enjoy peace and security without effort, the reconciliation of our democratic ideals and practices with even a somewhat diluted brand of military control presents an unprecedented difficulty. Its attempted solution should not be left entirely to the judgment and conscience of military leaders. The scholarship and technical competence of the respective contributors are well known. Four have had experience in the armed services; all are acutely aware of the dangers of military usurpation, but are equally aware of the present uncertainty concerning the ability of international organizations to preserve the peace.

Waldemar Kaempffert demonstrates the close relationship between scientific experimentation and the techniques of war. From the invention of gunpowder to the fission of uranium, physical science has felt the impact of war and has made important contributions to war; today, biological science and medicine are increasingly utilized. The ever-tightening grip of the military upon scientific research in time of peace, supported by the lavish use of public funds, creates a clear and present danger, made greater because of the neglect of the social sciences.

The important problem of recruitment and training is discussed by Hanson W. Baldwin. He rejects universal military training as unsuited to our technical needs and as dangerous to American concepts. He argues cogently for a professional force recruited by voluntary enlistment and highly trained for atomic-age warfare. Baldwin's program recommends a more effective understanding between the military and diplomatic serv-

ices, a competent intelligence system, and a home-front defense for disaster-control.

The practical difficulties in securing and retaining an effective civilian control of the military establishment are explained by Paul H. Appleby. The secretary of national defense, unless he is merely a civilian advocate for the insatiable demands of the military, should advise the President and assist him in representing the public interest. Civilian control must be exercised through political channels and by political officials, and he outlines the administrative techniques by which military administration, planning, and operation can receive systematic civilian review.

Many Americans today are deeply concerned, and with considerable justification, at the influence of the military in the conduct of foreign affairs. Quincy Wright gives an able analysis of the constitutional aspects of the situation and shows that, in the past, the military mind has not been a significant factor in the United States. He recommends that military opinion and military method in foreign policy be supplemented by more adequate presidential staffing, better intelligence from non-military sources, and more coördination at the lower levels through informal contacts between State Department and defense department officials.

T. V. Smith describes with characteristic felicity of phrase the civil and military relationship in conquered areas. Despite the great differences in the various peoples involved, his opinion is that military government was conducted with reasonable conformity to some of the cardinal principles of our political faith, including the separation of powers and the separation of church and state. In fact, the military in certain places became an instrumentality to assist in the organization of civilian government. In his revealing appraisal of the returned veteran, Dixon Wecter describes the transition from soldier to civilian, the attitude of the veteran regarding national and international issues, veterans and veteran organizations in civilian activities and in politics, pressure and otherwise. Adlai Stevenson observes some tentative, but encouraging, factors in civil-military relations in the United Nations.

A lucid restatement of the problem of civilian control in American political institutions is presented by Charles E. Merriam. Security for America, he asserts, cannot be obtained through isolation, with or without militarism. It is conditioned upon a jural order of the world maintaining peace, a democracy that will distribute fairly the gains of civilization, and a recognition of common values and common ideals.

Stanford University. THOMAS S. BARCLAY.

Farming and Democracy. By A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1948. Pp. ix, 227. $3.00.)

In this scholarly book, Griswold examines owner-operated family farming as the "backbone of democracy." He places the history of this idea

parallel with the development of policy for agriculture in England, France, and the United States. In Britain, the enclosure acts, primogeniture and entail, and emphasis upon "scientific farming" led to landed estates and a system of gentleman (tenant) farmers. Repeal of the Corn Laws marked the British departure from supporting agriculture and the agrarian way of life to a policy "in favor of cheaper food and greater commercial opportunity" (p. 66). Later efforts to favor family farms through "small-holdings" acts proved failures. In France, adherence to private property, and the heritage of the Revolution in abolishing feudalism, establishing equal rights among heirs, and redistributing confiscated land—all these, plus population pressure, have made for *parcellement*, "the major curse of French agriculture" (p. 88). Thus France remains with some 36 per cent of her working population in agriculture, on some 4,000,000 holdings, of which only four per cent exceed 125 acres. In contrast, Britain has six per cent of her working population in agriculture on 450,000 holdings, of which 21 per cent (comprising two-thirds of the agricultural land) exceed 100 acres. So far, no policy of *remembrement*, or consolidation of agricultural holdings, has been able to reverse French agricultural development. Whereas Britain merely ignored Jefferson, the wretched conditions of French peasantry "resulted from a corruption of the Jeffersonian ideal rather than its fulfillment, from the exaggeration of its several elements: individualism, agrarianism, *laissez faire, laissez passer*" (p. 127). In the United States, "our greater wealth of land and natural resources has enabled us . . . to industrialize like the British and protect the agricultural *status quo* like the French . . . " (p. 175).

In any event, democracy has no particular champion in agriculture. No force other than democracy "is likely to control and direct 'the sweep of mechanization' toward democratic ends, in farming . . . or in any other field of enterprise. . . . The lesson is plain in history. Family farming cannot save democracy. . . . Only democracy can save the family farm" (p. 204).

Considering Griswold's ability in research and expression, it is unfortunate that his emphasis is so strongly upon developments in farm sizes and the distribution of income to farmers and among farmers. Thus the following are either neglected or cursorily mentioned: the relationship of farmers and farm organizations to political parties; farmers' electoral participation; farmers' share in public office (either appointive or elective); and the nature and effect of farmers' pressure for goals other than those immediately involved in agricultural policy, e.g., for or against extension of the suffrage, reform of elections, "democratization" of political parties, extension of public education, and regulation of business. Such analyses would give more point to sweeping comments on p. 180.

Some detailed comments: FSA coöperative farms were managed by

men employed and paid by the government (p. 168). The land-use planning program was not suspended during the war, as implied on p. 185, but specifically proscribed by Congress. The Grange is also strong in the Pacific Northwest, and the Farmers' Union would be more correctly identified with the northern great plains and Oklahoma (p. 190). Although the increase in tenancy to 42 per cent of all farmers in 1935 is according to the census, Black's analysis led to the conclusion that "only one farm in four in the United States has a bona fide tenant upon it." *Parity, Parity, Parity* (1942), p. 21, cf. Griswold, pp. 5–6. Again (pp. 129–30) the striking decline in agricultural population, from 30 to 25 millions (approximately) in 1940–45, is over-stated by acceptance of the 1945 Census figure of 23,558,000, without noting the qualifications which suggest considerable under-enumeration in 1945, because of changed methods (Census of Agriculture, 1945, Vol. II, pp. 279–81).

CHARLES M. HARDIN.

University of Chicago.

The Memoirs of Cordell Hull. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1948. 2 vols. Pp. xii, 1804. $10.50.)

There is already a considerable literature, in the nature of "inside information," on Franklin D. Roosevelt and his administration, the events leading up to World War II, and the complex problems, military, diplomatic, economic, and political, of the war itself and of the uneasy peace that is its aftermath. The recollections of James A. Farley, Raymond Moley, Frances Perkins, Henry L. Stimson, Harold L. Ickes, and Harry Hopkins are significant contributions to an understanding of this supremely exciting period of our history, and now Cordell Hull has added his memoirs to the list. In two volumes, eight parts, 124 chapters, and nearly 2,000 pages, Hull tells his story of these years, and the bulk alone is suggestive of its scope and detail. One part, consisting of twelve chapters, and less than one-tenth of the book, is devoted to his early life and political career; all the rest deals with his twelve years as Secretary of State and with the problems of foreign policy with which he was directly concerned.

Those problems included, however, Hitler and his Germany, the Manchurian affair, Mussolini and the Ethiopian affair, disarmament, Russian recognition, the Good Neighbor policy, the trade agreements program, relations with the League of Nations and World Court, the League sanctions against Italy, neutrality, lend-lease, Japan and Pearl Harbor, relations with Spain, relations with Vichy France, relations with De Gaulle, relations with Russia, the development of the United Nations, and the vast complex of diplomatic and quasi-diplomatic problems in connection with the war operations—one needs but to recall them to appreciate the

number and variety and importance of the problems with which Hull deals in these volumes; and in respect to these problems Hull provides a painstaking account and a most revealing insight into the individual officials, viewpoints, and methods of the State Department, the White House, Congress, and other agencies that brought about some kind of policy or solution in each case.

At the time of Hull's appointment as Secretary of State, many were surprised, and some doubted his qualifications for the post. Actually, his rigorous upbringing and limited formal education in the Tennessee mountains developed honesty, tenacity, sincerity, and a self-reliance that were notable characteristics of his conduct of foreign policy; his political experience—state legislator at 21, circuit judge at 31, member of the House at 34 and for ten terms, member of the Democratic National Committee for 14 years and its chairman for three years, Senator for two years when appointed to the cabinet, always active in Tennessee and national politics—tended to make him cautious and tolerant, but also persistent and even courageous, if not highly imaginative, in pressing for the ultimate policy in which he believed.

Hull's close relations with Franklin D. Roosevelt began early in 1931, when they joined in opposing the Smith-Raskob control of the Democratic party; and Hull claims to have engineered the California-Texas deal in the Democratic convention of 1932 that brought about Roosevelt's nomination. An old-fashioned liberal ("I considered myself a Gladstone liberal in the 1890's"), Hull was never enthusiastic about the New Deal or about Mrs. Roosevelt, but he gave the President his complete loyalty, did not oppose the New Deal measures, and devoted himself to foreign affairs. Even here, he and Roosevelt were not always in agreement (for example, on the Economic Conference and on the nature of the United Nations), and there were occasions when Hull felt himself by-passed and contemplated resignation; but in general he and the President saw eye-to-eye on foreign policy, or Hull was able by his quiet persistence to bring the President around to his own point of view (for example, for a universal United Nations organization instead of several regional or functional organizations).

Hull's sturdy internationalism and genuine belief in world organization are clearly evident throughout his public career. He strongly supported the League of Nations and was disgusted with Lodge and the reservationists and irreconcilables, whom he characterizes as "Senator Lodge and his group of purely selfish isolationists of 1919 and 1920 whose policy was rule or ruin" (I, p. 217); in fact, he was convinced that no compromise was possible with Lodge and his group, that "if Wilson had undertaken to accept their purported offer of acceptance of the League with some reservations, the next morning we would have found that the Republicans,

under the leadership of Reed and the others, with Lodge stanking out in front, would have made more demands" (I, p. 103). Hull was disturbed by the Washington Disarmament Conference, largely because it seemed to him an attempt to sabotage the League through the substitution of a regional arrangement. He sought constantly, as Secretary of State, to bring the United States into closer relationships with the League, and thereby to strengthen that organization, although he moved cautiously, probably too cautiously, for fear of the isolationists, and was disposed to blame the other Powers, rather than the United States, for the League's failures. He was profoundly shocked that our entry into the World Court, urged by every President and overwhelmingly voted by the Senate in 1926, was finally blocked in 1935, when Senate support again seemed completely assured, by the week-end propaganda of William Randolph Hearst, Father Coughlin, and Will Rogers (I, pp. 387–389). He moved steadily and vigorously, as soon as the war made conditions ripe, towards the United Nations, which is patterned very closely on Hull's ideas, even in respect to the now much-debated veto (II, p. 1683). His illness and resignation, which made his presence at San Francisco impossible, prevented the dramatic culmination to which he was fully entitled, but they did not prevent the quiet satisfaction which he felt over the event.

In respect to the United Nations, Hull adds a good deal of detail to what was already known about the problem of understandings with Churchill and Stalin, neither of whom was easily brought into line for a world organization, and particularly he makes clear the difficulty of persuading Roosevelt, who wanted something very much and gave up reluctantly his preference for regional and functional organizations (II, pp. 1640–1647). Hull also adds to our knowledge of the work of the State Department in the development of plans, and especially in respect to the consultation with Congressional leaders and the policy of bipartisanship. For some of these matters Hull may tend to take undue credit to himself at the expense of Sumner Welles, who bore the burden of carrying on these operations during the preliminary stages, but with whom friction had already developed on various matters, including by this time the very basis of a world order.

In general, Hull, although modest and tolerant of other views, is quite certain of the moral, legal, and political correctness of his own policies. His defense of these policies in respect to Franco Spain and Vichy France will seem to many somewhat legalistic and labored, but probably a good defense under all the circumstances. Of all that he did, he takes the greatest pride in the trade agreements program, which represented the ideal of his political and economic thinking, and the value of which he may have over-emphasized, but which he nevertheless understood was by no means the sole panacea for all the world's ills.

The volumes are written in a straightforward, simple, and homely style ("There [at the London Economic Conference] I was rawhided unmercifully") that reflects Hull's honesty and sincerity, but lack of brilliance. He was assisted in the preparation of the book by Lt. Col. Andrew Berding and a small staff, who have admirably kept the Hull flavor throughout. Altogether, these memoirs constitute an invaluable contribution to the history of the Roosevelt period.

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL.

University of Illinois.

The More Perfect Union. BY R. M. MACIVER. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1948. Pp. vii, 311. $4.00.)

This volume is concerned with relations among groups in the United States, and, more particularly, "with the tensions, rifts, and cleavages between groups of different origin, stemming from different peoples or races" (p. 11). Its purpose is not only to analyze but to provide ways of alleviating the impact of prejudice against minority groups which results in denial of public opportunity. The author stresses the inadequacy of mere statement of facts about group discrimination. He feels that many scientific studies are barren just because they carry no message to the makers of policy. "Political scientists, economists, and sociologists are being forced by the demands of our times to realize that much of their research is abortive unless they draw from it the lessons it can teach" (p. 18). The facts do not necessarily speak for themselves. The analyst must speak for them.

Professor MacIver, therefore, has not only presented a statement of relevant facts on his chosen subject, frankly drawing many of them from the research of other investigators, but has attempted to show what can be done about the problem of discrimination. He calls his study an investigation in social engineering and expresses the hope that it will "indicate the potentialities that lie in the harnessing of scholarly investigation to social needs" (p. 23). He presents his subject in a series of chapters, breaking down part of it into discussions of what he calls the economic front, the political front, and the educational front, attempting to show the interrelatedness of the basic problems, from whatever angle they may be seen.

The gist of what he has to say is presented in a final chapter entitled "Some Conclusions." Here again he stresses his contention that what is needed is not a new series of detached studies, but "a direct and coördinated exploration of the methods by which these phenomena may be combated and controlled" (p. 241). He presents various suggestions in terms of broad lines of strategy. He emphasizes first of all the need for stressing the national welfare as a basis for attack upon discrimination. The frustration of minority groups operates as a disintegrating process

at the heart of national unity. It diminishes our influence in world affairs and tends to discredit the more far-reaching programs of American statesmen. "It follows that those who seek to educate our people should lay primary stress, not on the disadvantages and frustrations suffered by the disparaged groups or by any one of them in particular, but on the common loss, injury, and discredit that the country as a whole, majorities as well as minorities, sustains from the cleavages, rifts, and tensions that ensue from the prejudicial and undemocratic treatment meted out to large portions of the citizen body" (pp. 245–246).

The author stresses the point that preëminence should be given to no one direction of attack on discrimination. It is better to attack on as many fronts as possible at the same time. He finds action much more effective than arguments directed at prejudices; there are greater rewards in improving the depressed conditions of suffering groups than in trying to convince prejudiced people that they ought not to be prejudiced. It is to be remembered that discrimination is likely to be enhanced by anything which increases social tensions generally and alleviated by anything which brings about relaxation of such tensions. The author stresses the importance of adequate leadership, noting the accomplishments of effective leadership in establishment of the wartime FEPC and in the passage of anti-discrimination laws in a few of the states. He stresses the fact that strategy should always be adapted to the prevailing *mores*, varying, therefore, from community to community.

With these and other proposals with respect to the various "fronts" for attack on the problem of discrimination, the author seeks to aid in the establishment of action programs. The book is illuminating and richly suggestive for those who wish not only to know about the subject but also to do something about it. The book is also significant of a trend in the social sciences away from the exclusively scientific and in the direction of the planning and support of action programs.

CARL BRENT SWISHER.

Johns Hopkins University.

The Press and the Constitution, 1931–1947. By J. EDWARD GERALD. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1948. Pp. viii, 173. $3.50.)

The political scientist should take notice when a journalist invades the hallowed precincts of the constitutional lawyer and explores the terrain with insight, imagination, thoroughness, and objectivity. Professor Gerald, who is on the journalism staff of the University of Minnesota, has done exactly that in *The Press and the Constitution, 1931–1947.*

Professor Gerald has as the purpose of his study "to examine the development of the concept of freedom of the press on the level of constitutional law during the period beginning with the Minnesota gag law case and end-

ing with the revision of the Wagner Act in 1947." During the period covered, characterized by "popular unrest and unusual governmental activity," there was a clash between "the two ancient philosophies, freedom by individual volition and freedom by group volition." In the clash, the press was affected in a two-fold way, or on two "levels," as Professor Gerald prefers to term it. On the first and basic level—its relation with the public—the press found itself the prize of contending forces of traditionalism and reform, with both forces seeking to use it in achieving social and political objectives. On the second level—its legal and constitutional rights—the press was affected by the reform program in the same manner that business was affected. Such matters as labor relations, social security taxes, and wage and hour laws presented unique problems, however, under the First and Fourteenth Amendments as applied to the press.

As a result of his research, Professor Gerald classifies the outstanding legal opinions of the period into the fields of contempt, picketing, the newspaper and social security legislation, taxation and the regulation of the press, restraint of trade as practiced by the Associated Press, and censorship through licensing of distribution. Chapters are devoted to each of these subjects. As might be anticipated, extensive consideration is given to such cases as Near v. Minnesota, Pennekamp v. Florida, Bridges v. California, Thornhill v. Alabama, Grosjean v. American Press., Inc., and the controversy between the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Chicago Sun*. Professor Gerald has a happy faculty not only of discussing the legal and factual background of cases adequately, but of following the decision through to show what actually happened as a consequence of court action.

While breadth of data and clarity of expression give this study a deserved preëminence, the conclusions reached are not new. Professor Gerald says that "beyond controversy, it appears that during the period [1931–1947] there has been a net gain to genuine human freedom." In commenting on the new importance of the Fourteenth Amendment in so far as it incorporates the First, he observes, however: "It is cold comfort for freedom that, as a fugitive from local law and popular consent, she has to be rescued from mistreatment by the power of a central and distant government."

The author has struck a compromise between diverting prose and careful statement of constitutional principle. In a subject loaded with legal niceties, the reader's pleasure is enhanced by such statements as: "the depression . . . drove many persons from the carnivals of trade to the temples of the mind. . . . "; "the press is a good wind that blows somebody ill all the time. . . . "; "the good John Barleycorn gave way to the New Deal as the leading cause of hangovers. . . . "; and "the thin steel of the Court's scalpel had to be run lightly . . . like that of a surgeon cutting away ragged scar tissue in preparation for a new graft."

The statements quoted perhaps unduly emphasize one aspect of Professor Gerald's study. Suffice it to say, the book is eminently readable, informative, and a worth-while addition to the library of any person interested in the problem of human rights. The value of the work is augmented by the inclusion of a selected bibliography of books, articles, and cases, and a brief section on how the justices of the Supreme Court voted in the more important cases.

WILLIAM O. FARBER.

University of South Dakota.

1946 Annual Survey of American Law (New York: New York University School of Law. 1947. Pp. xciv, 1497).

Due to the unusually large volume of legislation passed by American legislatures in the biennium 1945–46 (49,644 pp.) and the consequent litigation necessary for its interpretation, the 1946 Survey necessarily assumed a voluminous proportion. However, the high standard of organization, logical articulation of material, lucidity of statement, and techniques of previous surveys have even been improved. The future of this indespensable publication is not a matter of its improvement but of maintaining its present character.

The mechanics of the volume are especially ingenious and utilitarian. It is divided into five parts: One—Public Law: In General (414 pp.); Two—Public law: Social, Business, and Labor Regulation (208 pp.); Three—Private Law (447 pp.); Four—Adjective Law (121 pp.); Five—Legal Philosophy, History, and Reform (307 pp.). Each part is subdivided into sections, and under each section are listed the topics discussed, with page references to their locations in the volume. The table of contents, in other words, shows in detail the composite character of each topic and the location of its discussion.

The table of cases contains more than sixty double-column pages and lists approximately 4,000 cases with page references. There is a nine-page table of statutes, rules, and executive and administrative orders, covering the work of both the federal and state governments, with references to constitutions, codes, and laws. These techniques, combined with a two-hundred and thirteen double-column page cumulative index, covering Volumes II, III, IV, and V, make the material in this volume readily and effectively available. Nothing is more vexing than spending hours attempting to find something in material which, for practical purposes, might as well not have been compiled.

The emphasis on the availability of the material in the 1946 Survey is especially noted because a 700-word review cannot analyze the subject-matter of this important contribution, which, of course, is primarily a reference work. Furthermore, the character of the analysis of the subject-

matter is guaranteed by the eminence of the contributors, most of whom distinguished themselves in previous volumes. Public law—international, constitutional, and administrative; procedural law; legal philosophy, history, and reform are especially well done.

International law is discussed under the headings of war crimes trials, power politics, United States foreign policy, internal adjustment, the trail of war, military occupation, labor reparations, American property abroad, immunities of government property, coastal waters, literature of international law, United Nations (specialized agencies, pacific settlement of disputes, international court of justice, security, atomic energy, disarmament, and trusteeship). Confusion in international law and its revolutionary character are emphasized and illustrated by the war criminal trials, over which the American bench and bar have been divided. The author states that opinion is gradually crystallizing in favor of this innovation. While there was no international legislation providing for such procedure, the author points out that international law has primarily developed by judicial precedent and accepted usage. Attention is called also to the issue of the President's proclamations relative to the continental shelf as being equally revolutionary in the field of international law. The author could have said that the President attempted to internationalize property of the American states without their consent or the approval of the family of nations and to place the *right of exploitation* of the property in the government of the United States without title or consent of the states or the approval of the family of nations. This action deserves to be called "the wonder of modern times," and sets a precedent for the other nations of the world to return to the land-grabbing process and imperalism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Speaking mildly, it is very doubtful whether such exhibitions of force should be listed in the process of development of international or any other kind of jurisprudence. When law becomes a matter of force, the mob must be recognized as a law-making body.

Constitutional law is discussed clearly, adequately, and effectively. The discussion is elaborated by copious and substantiating footnotes. The subject-matter is divided into: (1) Jurisdiction of Military Tribunals over Civilians; (2) Constitutional Power of Federal Government over State Activities; (3) Justiciable Controversy; (4) Delegation of Legislative Power; (5) Interstate Commerce; (6) Due Process of Law; (7) Full Faith and Credit; (8) Eminent Domain; (9) Impairment of Obligation of Contracts; (10) Constitutional Aspects of Criminal Law; and (11) the Constitutionality of Reciprocal Inheritance Statutes. In general, the development of constitutional law is characterized by less respect for the doctrine of *stare decisis*, more liberality in the delegation of legislative power, further expansion of the connotation of interstate commerce, with the re-

sult of further destruction of the rights of the states. The author states that the opinion in the case of New York v. United States (326 U.S. 572) "casts a shadow over the future relation of state and nation" (p. 157). It is shown that while the Court is permitting Congressional supremacy over the regulation of commerce, it is granting the states the power to tax interstate commerce if they do not discriminate against it.

The field of administrative law is ably and thoroughly discussed by former Dean Vanderbilt. After a brief but suggestive discussion of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the Federal Tort Claims Act, the development of administrative law is analyzed under the following headings: (1) Separation of Powers, (2) Delegation of Powers, (3) Procedure (hearing, subpoena), (4) Execution of Administrative Orders, and (5) Judicial Review (exhaustion of administrative remedies, findings of fact, questions of law, administrative interpretation, *res adjudicata*, discretionary powers, general scope). The significant change in the development of administrative law in 1946 was the overthrow of a host of judicial precedents by legislation, the effectiveness of which remains to be determined by administrative and judicial interpretation.

While space forbids further evaluation of this monumental work, fairness requires it to be said that its other sections are authoritatively and suggestively done. It is easily the best of the surveys yet published and raises high expectations for the future.

C. PERRY PATTERSON.

University of Texas.

Puerto Rican Paradox. By VINCENZO PETRULLO. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1947. Pp. vii, 181. $3.00.)

Puerto Rico has tended to receive much less attention from writers than other areas of the Western Hemisphere. It usually is not included in Latin American texts because it is now a part of the United States, while students of United States history have such a large field that Puerto Rico receives rather scant attention. The result has been such a widespread lack of knowledge in the United States as to conditions and problems in the island that the latter can almost claim the title of a "stepchild" territory. In his recently published volume, *Puerto Rican Paradox*, Vincenzo Petrullo has written with the direct objective of correcting this situation, and has done an excellent job of depicting Puerto Rican problems and the demands and desires of its citizens for their solution.

Many of the present difficulties of Puerto Rico have their origins in the history of the island before it became a possession of the United States in 1898; and this background is well described in Mr. Petrullo's work. The basic culture of the area is that of other former Spanish colonies, and

Puerto Ricans look on themselves as Latin Americans even though now they are citizens of the United States. A preference for rural life is another Puerto Rican heritage, and this has persisted even though available land is completely insufficient to support a decent standard of living. The rigid class system of the colonial period likewise still affects island life, and even the slight progress made toward autonomy before Puerto Rico became a possession of the United States forms a basis for the demands of at least one of its present-day political parties.

Annexation has brought additional problems. An improved health program has only intensified an acute and serious over-population. Anglo-American ideas on government, morality, and economics have come into conflict with those of an earlier period, until Mr. Petrullo notes that many Puerto Rican educators and publicists feel that the present pressures on the inhabitants from "two standards of conduct and two sets of life values" make it impossible for them to achieve the mental security and stability needed for happiness. This and other factors have tended to create in Puerto Ricans an exaggerated and sensitive nationalism and to increase agitation for autonomy.

While Mr. Petrullo's study is written with a deep sympathy for the Puerto Rican point of view, he does not fall into the error of many island writers who find nothing good in Puerto Rico's association with the United States. The problems he describes are not easy of solution, but he suggests certain lines of action which may contribute greatly toward improvement in conditions and an increase in understanding between Puerto Rico and the United States. In any case, the author has supplied an aid to possible better understanding in his well-written and thoughtful study of a territorial "paradox."

DUNBAR ROWLAND.

University of Southern California.

The South Old and New; A History, 1820–1947. By FRANCIS BUTLER SIMKINS. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1947. Pp. xx, 527. $6.00.)

It is fitting that the techniques of the "new history," now come of age, should be applied regionally. Professor Simkins has done well and comprehensively his self-assigned, difficult task of describing and analyzing all phases of Southern living for a century and a quarter. In addition to the traditional economic and political life of the South, an arduous enough assignment, the author of *The South Old and New* has set out to review developments in art, music, literature, nutrition, education, agriculture, and business. To say that Professor Simkins has done his job well is high praise; to say that he has done it completely would be hyperbole. Only God could see the total picture.

Perhaps with a touch of envy, political scientists must acknowledge

that historians are akin to God. Politicians frequently appeal to the "verdict of history" when the contemporary voice of the people, which, by aphorism, is the voice of God, seems a bit uncertain. So far as this reviewer knows, no statesman has ever appealed to the verdict of political science. Even discounting this note of professional envy of a sister discipline, it is a matter of grave concern how the verdict of history comes to be determined unless it is by people who call themselves historians. How is "war guilt" finally decided? Who "caused" the Civil War? Professor Simkins seems to adopt the same thesis with respect to Lincoln and the Confederacy in 1861 that a political scientist-historian is applying to Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Japanese in 1941. It appears that Lincoln lured or seduced the fine Southern gentlemen into appearing to be the aggressors. With regard to Fort Sumter, Lincoln's action "was so devious, so subtle, and perhaps so confused, that it is almost as difficult for the historian to understand as it was for the men of the times" (p. 133). Though some historians think he blundered (this is the verdict of history), "It is more likely that, with a subtlety approaching the diabolical, he provoked the Confederates into firing upon Fort Sumter in order to solidify Northern public opinion." "Provoking to assault" is a type of logic with definite limitations. It would be interesting to have the opinions of the courts upon a defense in a rape case where it was argued that the defendant was provoked to assault by the victim who, though resisting the advances of the accused, seemed to be coquettish at the time. This kind of logic needs deeper examination.

In Professor Simkins's volume, the "verdict of history" appears to be allergic to Abraham Lincoln. In addition to the animadversions just pointed out, the author refers to Lincoln as a "canny theorist" (p. 140) who, instead of calling the civil struggle a "war," maintained that it was "an endeavor to reëstablish constitutional authority." Political scientists may note that the verdict of history may depend upon the marshalling or allocation of adjectives, for "wise philosopher" might be substituted for "canny theorist" with significant differences in meaning to Southern students who presumably will study this objective textbook on a very controversial subject. Though Lincoln was a "canny theorist" (p. 148) when he insisted upon enforcing the constitution in opposition to the wishes of the South, several pages later he has become "tactful" and "not a doctrinaire" (p. 177) when he was lenient in his Reconstruction policy.

Perhaps these are minor flaws in what is, after all, the best single-volume history of the South now in print. Professor Simkins's definition and conclusion seem to be that the South is an attitude of mind, perhaps just a prejudice, though stereotype is probably a more accurate word, built upon the illusion of white superiority (hence the doctrine of white supremacy). This is not stated openly, but is intimated strongly. Perhaps

if the voice of history were less Delphic and more forthright, it would speak the truth so clearly that a new generation of Southern students reading and accepting the verdict of history would cease to follow the historic delusion. But would they be Southerners if they did so?

JASPER B. SHANNON.

University of Kentucky.

Constitutional Dictatorship; Crisis Government in the Modern Democracies. BY CLINTON L. ROSSITER. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. Pp. 322. $3.50.)

Constitutional government is basically the institutionalization of general and binding limitations to which the exercise of political power by all organs of the state has to conform. Obviously, within this context the cardinal problem is that of how constitutional government can be preserved in times of crisis. To tackle it by way of a comprehensive treatise requires no small courage on the part of the author, which in this case is matched by the publisher, who—be it noted with some envy—overcame the usual commercial inhibitions to bring a scholarly volume, handsomely appointed, to the public.

At the outset, it should be stated that this is a valuable contribution to a subject of potentially great importance in this period of world revolution. Such solid studies on comparative constitutional law and politics are altogether rare in the provincial climate of our political science.

Of course the issue of constitutional government under emergency conditions has not gone unobserved, even in this country, whose constitutional fabric, with the possible exception of a brief interlude in the Civil War, has never been put to a severe test. In Europe, and equally so in Latin America, crisis government and its institutions have attracted deserved attention since the First World War. Moreover, the relentless quest for a strong executive within the confines of constitutionalism on which constitution-making has focused ever since, particularly in the hectic thirties, is precisely the effort to make constitutional dynamics more crisis-resistant.

Four constitutional patterns were selected by the author for the demonstration of his basic thesis, namely, that emergency powers entrusted to the executive are indispensable for any constitutional system to protect it, in times of internal or external crisis, by—if possible—constitutional methods for which the routine techniques of parliament and public opinion are inadequate. The countries discussed are Weimar Germany (pp. 29–73), using enabling acts and the notorious Article 48; France (pp. 75–129), where the state of seige and the institution of *pleins pouvoirs* are the foremost instrumentalities; Britain (pp. 131–205), including martial law, the DORA of World War I fame, the Emergency Powers Act

of 1920, and the various Emergency Powers (Defense) Acts of the Second World War; and finally the United States (pp. 207–288), where the author believes (p. 256) "the techniques of executive initiative, executive leadership in legislation, an abbreviated legislative process, the delegation of powers by statute, and the expansion of the administrative branch" to be indices of crisis-conditioned deviations from democratic normalcy. These analyses are introduced by a none too profound discussion of the Roman dictatorship and concluded with a summarizing projection of the author's findings into the future. For the treatment of these four, or rather five, different political civilizations, the author has sufficiently familiarized himself with much of the existing literature and some of the judicial practices. More penetration into the latter would have been instrumental in reducing the confines of what he calls constitutional dictatorship, since, in contrast to Germany, where the courts indulged in positivist subservience to the government in power, the judicial branch of the other countries kept a vigilant control over the use of emergency powers of whatever nature. It may be added that the inclusion of Latin American experience with crisis government, particularly in view of its impact on federal-state relations, would have been highly rewarding.

Such comprehensive discussions are exposed to two inherent dangers. In the first place, unless the writer is a constitutional expert in all countries under investigation, legal and political misunderstandings are hardly avoidable. For reasons of space, reference is made here to the German section only. Although the author has worked his way laboriously through the maze of controversies in which Article 48 is embedded, the discussion is studded with inaccuracies and political misjudgments, attributable, perhaps, to his acceptance of the opinions of some authoritarian-minded German writers which by now subsequent foreign discussions have amply rectified. For example, the suppression of Hitler's Beer-hall *putsch* in 1923 by the Bavarian *Land* police had nothing to do with Article 48 (p. 40); there is no proof that the application of Article 48 by the *Länder* was "successful" (p. 63), the situation in Bavaria demonstrating just the opposite; incidentally, von Kahr, Bavarian *Generalstaatskommissar* in 1923, was not appointed under the Reich emergency powers (p. 40). The reviewing board of history by no means has confirmed the A+ mark accorded to the "democratic" Chancellor Brüning, whom subsequent investigations have convicted as the foremost grave-digger of the Republic. To bracket him (p. 3) with Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt as the democratic saviour of his country may seem outright sacrilegious to many; and to term Article 48 "a magnificent assertion of the sovereignty of the people, manifested in a forthright expression of the right of national self-preservation" (p. 60), is a startling observation. Military Government saw to it that the mistake of 1919 was not repeated in the new South

German constitutions, contrary to the author's statement (p. 60). Moreover, the section fails throughout to distinguish properly between the genuine emergency powers under Section 2 of the Article and federal intervention under Section 1 (*Bundesexekution*), indispensable in any federal structure as evidenced by experience in Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico).

The other defect, more structural in nature, arises from the fact that in a Procrustean manner heterogeneous techniques and institutions are lumped together to suit the chosen assumption of "constitutional" dictatorship. This is much more than a problem of semantics. Dictatorship, in the classical doctrine since Bodin equivalent to, or approximating, arbitrary or despotic government, is, in the modern usage, government without constitutional restraints in time and in scope. But when a strong executive (for example, the British cabinet, which, to the author, is a constitutional dictatorship, or the American President, supported by Congress) is democratically controlled in the exercise of delegated powers, and when the courts continue to scrutinize executive ordinances under delegated powers from the viewpoint of *excès des pouvoirs* (or under judicial review) the appellation of dictatorship is palpably inapposite. Crisis government, when subject to continued democratic control, as demonstrated by France, Britain, and the United States, is not "dictatorial," whether constitutional or otherwise. When the author contends (p. 239) that "Lincoln's actions form history's most illustrious precedent for constitutional dictatorship," he is disregarding his own material to suit his semantic premises, since practically all of Lincoln's actions were supported by Congressional approval and ratification. Nor can the techniques employed in and after 1933 by Roosevelt in any way be spoken of as "dictatorial," because they were either subsequently ratified or authorized in advance by Congress, with full support of public opinion, which neither Brüning nor the outright presidial cabinets ever enjoyed. Dictatorial they were only in the opinions of those to whom the selfish exploitation of the community by free enterprise is an inalienable natural right. Of this the author seems well aware when he admits that the term as used in the American environment is merely a "convenient hyperbole" (p. 209), or a "figure of speech" (p. 286). Exactly the same holds true for the carefully hedged-in applications of emergency powers in Britain and France; and it may be noted that both French constitutions of 1946 explicitly forbid the delegation of legislative powers. Once the line of demarcation between a constitutionally strong government and an executive acting extra-constitutionally, even for the sake of saving democratic institutions (a rare historical occurrence indeed), is obscured, the term "constitutional" dictatorship becomes rather meaningless. If the author wishes to identify a strong with a dictatorial government, the exploration of "authoritarian" government would have been helpful.

Though it is not the definitive treatise on a fascinating subject, the book, distinguished by learning and considerable ability in handling technically complex material, is a definite enrichment of political literature if for no other reasons than for having assembled the widely scattered legislative and jurisprudential facts. Political scientists will be indebted to the author for assistance both in teaching and in research.

KARL LOEWENSTEIN.

Amherst College.

The Problem of Germany. By HOYT PRICE AND CARL E. SCHORSKE. (New York: Council on Foreign Relations. 1947. Pp. xxv, 161. $2.00.)

The Only Way; How Can the Germans Be Cured? By KARL BARTH. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1947. Pp. vi, 122. $2.00.)

Recent developments, such as the six-power agreement on Western Germany and the currency reform just put into effect, have but enhanced the value of the study conducted by Messrs. Price and Schorske. The authors have eminently succeeded in making concrete more general statements of the German problem, of which there have been a great variety in late years. They not only present a review of the several fields in which the task of German reconstruction awaits action, but indicate the requirements for a successful integration of Germany with the rest of Western Europe. As the latter objective has become approved policy, this little book may be consulted for pertinent data.

The study was undertaken in answer to a questionnaire from the Netherlands Society for International Relations which the Council on Foreign Relations helped to prepare in 1946. The authors were assisted by a group of experts for whom Mr. Allen W. Dulles broadly outlined the issues in his article "Alternatives for Germany," published in *Foreign Affairs*, April, 1947. Happily this article is reprinted here and serves as an introduction to the volume. The whole book thus evinces a sense of the dilemma which evolves from the apparent conflict between a general European interest in the revival of German industry and a prosperous Germany as a menace to peace. Nor are there any facile assertions about the sure establishment of democratic institutions in that country, where the democratic tradition has had at best a precarious existence. The question of how, in view of this, "a democratic culture" sustaining peaceful policies can at all develop is the authors' chief concern. It is gratifying to see a study of such perspicacity published in the English language; its reading is recommended in particular to sentimentalists and illusionists on present-day Germany. Certain positive suggestions emanating from the book have been met in the directive of July 11, 1947, to the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Forces of Occupation in Germany—the text of which is appended to the volume—in the *revised* Level-of-Industry

Plan and other measures since adopted. A notable defect, however, seems to lie in the fact that scant attention has been paid to long-term prospects of trade between Eastern and Western Europe; for such trade not only would affect the future of the German economy, but might influence the possibilities of political readjustment.

Dr. Price, in the first part, deals with the economic aspects. His analysis of the food problems yields the important result that "even with full agricultural recovery" the import requirement for each non-farmer consumer in the western zones will be at least 570 calories per day. The necessary reorganization of German agriculture, the author believes, could be accomplished in the main through the removal of import impediments. This would involve a redistribution of landed property—whether it is brought about by a land reform so-called or by automatic shifts to specialized farming—with wholesome effects on the political and social pattern. But the decisive question is how the economy of a "Rump" Germany can be integrated with the world economy so that "the best possible allocation of the world's food-producing resources" would be secured. Other chapters show the situation with regard to industrial raw materials—now to be relieved through Germany's participation in the European Recovery Program—to transportation and population, including labor. It is interesting to note that despite overcrowding there exists, paradoxically, serious labor shortages in many industries, due chiefly to severe occupational dislocations and low productivity per employee; and further, that popular apprehensions that Germany may have won the war of numbers, although she lost it militarily, are unfounded; but that, in view of developments in other European countries, "the demographic war is not yet over."

Three chapters deal with the problems of German industry, international control of the Ruhr, and currency reform. The facts are given which made currency reform the indispensable next step in the reconstruction of the German economic system. Basic errors and the political pitfalls in all "pastoralization" projects, and the inadequacy of the older Level-of-Industry Plan are pointed out. In the opinion of the author, the main issue concerning industrial production is not quantitative restriction but qualitative control and the supervision of trading practices. With some of these generalizations one may take issue. For instance, arguments for doing away with *all* quantitative limitations should also take into account that, under favorable credit conditions, uncontrolled expansion might lead to another "conquest of world markets" which would return to power the very elements that have in the past supported imperialist policies. On the other hand, the writers' reasoning on the reparations question, especially regarding the removal of industrial plants, and on proposals for a political separation of the Ruhr can hardly be questioned. A compromise

solution such as that envisaged in the London Agreement on International Control of the Ruhr would appear to offer the best chance of success. It does not seem plausible, however, that the allocation of coal should not be subject to quadripartite action if not all indigenous products (e.g., food) are subject to the same procedure (p. 37); for coal is preëminently a concern of the whole European economy. By the same token, it is true, the suggestion of special treatment for Upper Silesia (advanced by Mr. Dulles) would seem justified; indeed, it suggests at least the possibility of a diplomatic initiative.

In the second part of the book, Professor Schorske scrutinizes the social and cultural components making up the problem. His findings lead to the conclusion that "the democratic potential is alarmingly weak" (p. 138). He points out how the historical conflict between nationalism and liberalism made the Germans tragically unaware of the need for adapting themselves to new world conditions; and lines are aptly drawn into the recent past and present. A detailed but rather dismal picture of contemporary trends as reflected in class attitudes and political parties is presented. The dangers in the situation where doctrinaire traditionalism and unregenerate Nazism side by side make up a formidable front of resistance to change are properly focussed. As the outstanding political weakness of the Germans, now rampant as ever, appears their incapacity to compromise differences. Here one may wonder whether permitting the Germans to revive their tortuous pre-Hitler politics almost immediately after surrender was a wise decision. The same might be said in regard to other institutional arrangements, causing the author to remark, for instance, that "the premature restoration of the universities has created one of the most serious obstacles to the democratization of Germany (p. 130). Likewise, the far-reaching "confessionalization" of many aspects of public life through the churches—Protestant and Catholic—may be interpreted as a sign of political immaturity.

With little of what is stated here does the reviewer find reason to quarrel. He feels, however, that the failure of the Social Democrats to fulfill their mission in the revolutionary situation after 1918 is glossed over too lightly. (It is a case, incidentally, which might serve to instruct not a few of our contemporaries.) Nor is sufficient attention given to the perpetual inclination of the "liberal" middle class to fall back on leadership which is in collusion with the vested interests of reaction. The sections on "The Universities" and "The Independent Intelligentsia," however, emphasize the inherited lack of socio-economic understanding in professional circles. The conclusion, then, that "little progress has been made by the Germans in exposing the historical and social causes of National Socialism" (p. 135) cannot take the reader by surprise. Serious attempts to understand the functioning of a democratic society and the conditions of adjustment to

the moving forces in the world have long been missing; and worse, none are in sight. One cannot help asking: Does present American policy with respect to political reconstruction, plus retrenchment—not to say *déroute*—in such basic matters as de-Nazification and de-cartellization, make for the necessary changes? Or has it helped to foster a new wave of reaction? And to what ends are such risks being taken? Owing to considerable mistakes made by the occupation authorities, a largely unrepentant Germany has emerged from the crucible of defeat, and conditions continue to exist "in which totalitarian methods flourish." The author is apprehensive lest in case of a definitive East-West split reactionary tendencies gain fully the upper hand in the Western zones. There is hope, perhaps, that in practicing coöperation with other Western nations through the instrumentalities of the Recovery Program the Germans will come to face realities. Even so, the outlook for the growth of democracy would be even more improved by a compromise between the Great Powers now holding sway over the disrupted country.

A comparison between the little book of Karl Barth, the renowned Swiss Protestant theologian, and Mr. Schorske's chapter on "Post-war Religious and Intellectual Trends" offers interesting parallels. Schorske shows, with ample documentation, that in the churches of Germany "moral confusion of a high order" prevails, as all over the intellectual scene. The existence of certain minority groups which oppose the identification of religious with conservative and nationalist thought cannot relieve our misgivings. They are corroborated by Barth's admonitions. He takes his German readers and correspondents to task for dodging realities, and enjoins them to learn coöperating on the level of immediate needs, instead of cultivating their parochial *Weltanschauungen;* in other words, they must think pragmatically, "somewhat as the British and the Swiss do," rather than in terms of ideologies. That coöperation, "for the sake of life itself," the author calls "Christian Realism." He also demands the recognition of collective guilt, i.e., of the fact that "the nation which elected Hitler chose at the same time to wage and to suffer total war" (p. 52). Moreover, education for obedience and political conformism must be replaced by the courage of insubordination against self-inflated authority—in short, a moral revolt is the prerequisite of a happier future. With all that, the more tangible therapeutics of reconstruction are not ignored. With an eye to them, Barth warns the Allies that they should not miss the opportunity of giving the Germans a practical demonstration of democracy which would refute misconceptions and distortions of their propaganda.

Barth's book, which consists of translations of a lecture and two letters from unnamed Germans, marking two characteristic trends of German thought, with Barth's answers, and the reprint of an article written for an

English newspaper, throws some interesting sidelights on the Swiss record during the Hitler régime. That record, Barth finds, is not without blemish; for the official attitude of Switzerland in those years was "a very clever one, but unfortunately all in all it has been all too clever" (p. 119). *Au fond* it was always clear that the people of the Swiss Confederation could never he neutral, mentally, in the world fight against National Socialism. But, according to Barth, only when responsibility is acknowledged can commensurate action be expected.

HENRY P. JORDAN.

New York University.

World Communism Today. By MARTIN EBON. (New York and Toronto: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1948. Pp. viii, 536. $4.50.)

In 1848, the initiators of "Scientific Communism" noted that the whole of old Europe was being haunted by the specter of Communism. Hence their "Communist Manifesto" was to "meet this nursery tale" with a disclosure of "their views, their aims, their tendencies." None the less, a century later, Martin Ebon can justly remark that while "the chances of Communism today are better than ever," it "remains the great unknown of our time."

In view of such a paradoxical situation, credit is due to any author attempting to throw light upon the Cummunist world movement of yesterday or today. As Ebon is mainly concerned with the present, the section of his book devoted to the history of the three Internationals and to the seven strategies of the Third International remains sketchy. The bulk of the work thus consists of a survey of the organization and policy of the Communist parties in the nearly three score and ten states of the planet. During his voyage around the world, which starts in Russia and ends in South Africa, the author introduces the reader to the Communist leaders and recent political developments of all the countries from A (Albania) to Y (Yugoslavia). In his final section, Ebon discusses the secret of the strength of Communism, the nature and techniques of the invisible Communist International, and the prospects of its final global triumph. Intimating that Communism is primarily a symptom of the disease of our society, he rejects the idea that a democracy can defeat Communism by outlawing it: "Only an out-and-out police state can outlaw the Communist party," and "even police states have not done so well at enforcing a ban on the Communist party."

According to Mr. Ebon, economic inequality and insecurity, as well as "the absence of a substantial middle class," are the main reasons for the growth of Communism." Therefore, "the next world economic crisis will give Communism its fourth major chance to achieve world domination."

Consequently, "Western civilization can answer Communism only by positive and constructive actions. It cannot fight Communism on the battlefields . . . and expect to win lasting victory. The tractor is, in the end, a weapon superior to the tank. The fire in the hearth sheds more warmth than a flame-thrower. Among the weapons in tomorrow's struggle, only security can make fear obsolete."

Statements such as these characterize Ebon's approach, which is that of a liberal, well-informed, and serious-minded journalist. Journalists, however, are often unburdened with historical and sociological knowledge. So is Mr. Ebon. In dealing with the October Revolution of 1917, e.g., he fails to mention the vital part played by Trotsky, and in evaluating the German elections of 1928 he mistakes the Nationalists for Nazis. More serious than such factual errors, however, is his failure to explain the economic and social setting in which the Communist parties operate. Moreover, he should have properly illuminated the total historical situation of the Socialist movement in the period of the First World War, a situation out of which developed the permanent and global split into the radical and reformist wings. Ebon intimates that Russian Communism's "psychological effect appears greater than its economic achievements." Still he fails to realize fully the consequences of the identification of international Communism with the Russian totalitarian and bureaucratic super-state. Hence he is probably wrong in assuming that a new depression will mean world victory for Communism. For he overlooks that, at least as long as the various Communist parties subordinate the "national" interests of their own countries to the idiosyncrasies of a foreign *élite*, any partial and temporary success is likely to encourage the growth of "native" anti-Russian Fascist movements. Such a development might very well create a stalemate between Communism and Fascism which could easily prove fatal to our civilization. If the author had made more use of the works of Martov, Rosenberg, and Borkenau, he might have come to grips with the more theoretical aspects of his subject. In spite of its shortcomings, the book is, nevertheless, most valuable as a well-organized and vividly written survey of the strategy and tactics of the unofficial Communist International and its sections in the period since 1945.

OSSIP K. FLECHTHEIM.

Colby College.

The English Local Government System. BY J. H. WARREN (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1946. Pp. 182. $2.25.)

The American political scientist will have a difficult time finding a more useful account of contemporary English local government than that contained in this compact volume. However, as the book was written for British readers, it assumes a knowledge of the political moves and con-

stitutional practices of that country which most Americans do not have. Thus, its particular usefulness here will be to students of comparative political institutions rather than to practitioners of the art of city and county government.

It is disappointing that the book tells very little of one development but slightly known in the United States: the effect on local political institutions of the great burden of civil defense they were required to carry during the war. The comment that out of the war experience "certain defects became apparent" is anything but informative. The greater space given to agitation for local-government reform is adequate notice to students of comparative local government that they can expect changes in the government of Britain's ancient boroughs, counties, districts, and parishes. While old forms survived the crises of the past decade, there is reason to feel confident that they will be changed in the next.

This reviewer found Mr. Warren's comparison of municipal service with national civil service—to the advantage of the former—most interesting. His argument is presented with clarity and effect. He might have told us something of relations that have grown up between specialists in Whitehall and their counterparts in local government and of any influence on policy that has stemmed from such contacts, but he does not deal with this subject. He finds occasion to repeat the familiar rhetoric about English local self-government with special emphasis on "self," but the sum of his dozen and a half references to national government-local government relations hardly serves to underline this emphasis.

The book is based largely on Mr. Warren's extensive study of and personal experience with British institutions, and while its usefulness is heightened by the author's critical approach to his problem, he could have lent force to his arguments by a greater use of pertinent foreign comparisons. As it is, the occasional—although rare—references to developments in local government on the Continent and in the United States prove effective each time employed. The value of the book might have been increased further had more illustrative material been included. However, this is but the first volume in a new "Town and County Hall Series." If the author, who is the new general editor of the series, hopes to capture and hold a considerable number of readers in this country, he may do well to include such material in future volumes. He is advised, at all events, that an index would prove a useful adjunct to succeeding publications.

CHARLES AIKIN.

University of California (Berkeley).

A Modern Law of Nations; An Introduction. By PHILIP C. JESSUP. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1948. Pp. viii, 221. $4.00.)

In his latest book, Professor Jessup has amply fulfilled the expectations of those who have looked forward with some impatience to a synthesis of

the recent series of articles in which the author outlined some of his proposals for a renovated law of nations. In bringing to bear upon the problem a rare legal erudition, an acute power of analysis, a lucid literary style, and a wide experience in international law and administration, Professor Jessup has avoided the extreme views of both the "cynic and the sciolist"—to borrow J. L. Brierly's phrase. The writer makes no exaggerated claims for the present imperfect legal order, nor does he minimize its shortcomings. He is fully aware of the necessity of reconciling conflicting interests, of balancing the requirements of stability and change, and of preserving continuity with the past while supplying that element of adaptability to changing needs, lack of which constitutes a principal defect of the existing system. " . . . Development," Professor Jessup asserts, "can best proceed by utilizing the experience of the past centuries, reviewed in the light of new concepts . . . . Ignorance of the progress already achieved in the development of international law over the past three centuries and blindness to the still primitive character of the international legal system are equally inimical to the further progress which must be made if all civilization is not to go the way of Hiroshima and Nagasaki" (p. 14).

Professor Jessup has written *de lege ferenda*, as he expressly points out; his work, however, is not a blue-print for some ideal world order unattainable in the foreseeable future, but a development of ideas, trends, and tendencies immanent in those branches of the law in which the concept of community interest has made some progress in the face of obstacles created by nationalism and its juridical formulation in the concept of sovereignty. Two main points are singled out as possible presumptions or "hypotheses" which may serve as bases for progress toward a modern law of nations: "The first is the point that international law, like national law, must be directly applicable to the individual. It must not continue to be remote from him, as is the traditional international law, which is considered to be applicable to states alone and not to individuals. The second point is that there must be basic recognition of the interest which the whole international society has in the observance of its law. Breaches of the law must no longer be considered the concern of only the state directly and primarily affected. There must be something equivalent to the national concept of criminal law, in which the community as such brings its combined power to bear upon the violator of those parts of the law which are necessary to the preservation of the public peace" (p. 2).

The implications of the first hypothesis and the effects of its possible acceptance upon the positive law are sketched, with pertinent illustrative detail, in chapters on "The Subjects of a Modern Law of Nations," "Recognition," "Nationality and the Rights of Man," "Responsibility of

States for Injuries to Individuals," and "The Law of Contractual Agreements." The influence of the concept of absolute sovereignty—"the quicksand upon which the foundations of traditional international law are built"—and the need for adopting a relative concept based upon the social and economic reality of interdependence determine the approach to chapters on "The Legal Regulation of the Use of Force" and "Rights and Duties in Case of Illegal Use of Force." The last two chapters are those most closely related to the changes in the international legal situation created by the establishment of the United Nations; and to those who are primarily preoccupied with the most pressing and imminent of our international problems they will appear to be the most significant of the entire work. Anyone, however, who may consider that excessive space has been devoted to those areas of the law out of which threats to the peace are unlikely to arise should refer to the writer's caution: "It is . . . not enough for the future of the international society to say that we must have a rule governing the use of atomic bombs and other weapons of mass destruction. It is not enough merely to have a law making war illegal. Such rules, even if backed by an adequate form of organization or government, would fail to create a well-ordered international society, the existence of which is a prerequisite to the successful functioning of any legal system. If there be no adequate rules of law governing the solution of the conflicts which are inherent in any human relations, frictions and tensions will develop to a point which will bring about breaches of the primary rules about weapons and wars; even in the most highly developed societies, underlying inequities and resulting strains produce riots, revolutions, and civil wars" (pp. 1, 2).

Professor Jessup does not underestimate the importance of the organizational developments which must take place before the world can achieve some form of government in which the collective will for peace will take precedence over the individual will of the sovereign state. This result must be achieved before the ultimate problem of the elimination of force for the solution of human conflicts can be resolved. The limited task which Professor Jessup has expressly set for himself is that of determining the nature and substance of the rules which the future international organization or government would be called upon to establish, apply, and enforce.

The author somewhat minimizes his own achievement in describing it as "a fragmentary approach." His slight but weighty volume represents, it is true, a selective synthesis of some of the most progressive tendencies immanent in the rules which have been emerging since the close of the First World War. But in Professor Jessup's thoughtful and balanced discussion "something new has been added." Every student of international

law will be gratified to note that *A Modern Law of Nations* bears the subtitle: *An Introduction.*

LAWRENCE PREUSS.

University of Michigan.

The Man in the Street. By THOMAS A. BAILEY. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1948. Pp. 334. $5.00.)

No great power has ever undertaken to conduct its foreign relations on such a broadly democratic basis as the United States. None has been compelled to struggle with such great constitutional and political obstacles to the smooth and effective formulation and execution of foreign policy. None has a greater reputation for caprice in foreign affairs. Now, when the United States has assumed such unprecedented international responsibilities, its ability to discharge them has become a matter of world-wide concern. Under these new circumstances, there is a special need for careful and expert examination of the rôle of American public opinion with respect to foreign policy. This is what Professor Bailey has set out to perform.

His inquiry ranges widely over the whole field of attitudes. Some chapters deal with attitudes toward such specific policies as the Monroe Doctrine and Freedom of the Seas. Others analyze attitudes toward the nature and direction of foreign policy, e.g., Manifest Destiny and Isolationism. Finally, there are chapters on the forces which influence public opinion about foreign policy. Here, xenophobia, apathy, ignorance, sectionalism, the melting pot, and others have their turn on the stage. For the more recent period, the author has made full use of relevant public opinion polls. His supporting and illustrative data for the earlier periods of our history consist of random excerpts from newspaper editorials, utterances by public figures, government documents, and the like.

This is a difficult book to appraise. It is written in a lively style, and the reader's interest never lags. But this reviewer felt that too great an effort had been made at deliberate popularization. Exactness has too often been sacrificed for a well-turned phrase of glib generalization. And an occasional statement is simply too broad to have much resemblance to ascertainable fact. Thus, for example, the author observes that American pacifists, "although not numerous, have been extremely vocal, well organized, and well financed, largely through the generosity of a millionaire philanthropist, Andrew Carnegie." Surely, this statement gives too much credit—or blame—to the activities of the various Carnegie-financed institutions. Also, this reader had difficulty on many an occasion in deciding whether a given statement of attitude was the author's own view or whether it was merely his estimate of the prevailing American view about the matter in question.

There also is the question of evidence. Many a generalization about American attitudes is supported only by a casual sentence plucked from a single newspaper editorial. Admittedly, such a sentence may in fact be representative of American opinion, but the reader who is aware of the complexity of American attitudes about almost anything is apt to shy away from such conclusions. This comment is in no way a reflection upon the author's deserved reputation for technical scholarship; it was, however, this reviewer's feeling that more evidence should have been presented in this book, or that the conclusions about mass attitudes should have been much less sweeping. Finally, and at the risk of being pedantic about a matter which the author may not have been able to control, this reviewer was not made happy by the fact that the book is virtually innocent of footnotes. At the very least, they could have been tucked away unobstrusively in the back of the volume.

The study of past group attitudes presents formidable technical difficulties. And this book, brilliant though it is at many points, indicates the need which confronts all students of public opinion for better tools for such research. Until these tools are devised, such interpretative essays as these represent our only means of dealing with the problem.

GRAYSON L. KIRK.

Columbia University.

Colonial Policy and Practice; A Comparative Study of Burma and Netherlands India. By J. S. FURNIVALL. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1948. Pp. xiii, 568. $7.50.)

Writers about the tropics tend to fall into two groups. There are the specialists who have an intensive knowledge of one particular dependency, but know little or nothing of others, and so fail to draw valuable comparisons and contrasts. Alternatively, the writer has an acquaintance with several dependencies, but the value of his work is often lessened by inadequate knowledge. The present book avoids both criticisms, and is an excellent and illuminating comparative study of British and Dutch colonial policy, based on first-hand knowledge.

In both dependencies, intensive economic development by foreign business interests began about 1870, when the philosophy of Europe was dominated by liberalism and *laissez faire*. From that time onwards, the life of the Indonesian and Burmese peasant farmers was increasingly affected, until their previous mediaeval social and economic life was in large measure transformed, particularly in Burma. While the economic forces at work were the same, the forms of rule were different. The British relied on direct rule and equality before the law, while the Dutch practiced indirect rule and carefully preserved native customary law.

The British abolished the traditional organs of central and local govern-

ment, and liberated the Burmese from various exactions and oppression. They provided them with honest judges who gave judgment strictly in accordance with the law, in place of the Burmese judges who expected presents from litigants. The British also abolished the hereditary chieftains who were the principal organ of local government. This is standard British practice, the theory being that a hereditary official abuses his power over the peasantry.

Unfortunately, the British swept away the good with the bad. The new British officials were incorruptible, but their subordinates were largely Indians who used their authority to extort money from the Burmese. As in India, the British official was usually unable to prevent this. To a large extent, the British ignored or else transformed the customary law which the Burmese understood, and gave them an alien law which they did not understand. Under Burmese customary law, for instance, interest on a mortgage could not accumulate beyond the sum originally borrowed, but the British courts recognized no limit. This played into the hands of the *chettiars*, a Hindu caste of money-lenders, who started to operate extensively in Burma about 1880.

At that time, the Burmese small farmers were beginning to colonize Lower Burma. They borrowed heavily from the *chettiar*, were unable to meet the mortgage payments, and lost their farms. The *chettiar* rented the land to Burmese tenants at extortionate rentals, and in a year or so the latter lost their land from inability to pay the rents. They either rented another farm with the same result, or else became landless laborers. *Laissez faire* decreed that the British government must not interfere with the free play of economic forces, and must rely on the courts to prevent injustice. By the time the doctrine of free private enterprise became discredited, the damage had been done, and the *chettiars* owned half the rice lands of Lower Burma.

Among the results were a prodigious increase in litigation, and an equally phenomenal growth in crimes of violence. The Burmese became bitterly hostile to the Indians, and eventually to the British who seemed to protect them. This was one reason why some of the Burmese helped the Japanese in 1941. Another was that, with the very best of intentions, the British had alienated the influential Buddhist monks, so that many of them assisted the invaders.

The Dutch imposed restraints on economic forces, strengthening personal authority and preserving the influence of custom. The author believes that this shielded the Indonesians to a considerable extent from the disintegrating effect of economic forces upon their civilization.

LENNOX A. MILLS.

University of Minnesota.

BRIEFER NOTICES

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

New York City is this year celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the consolidation of the municipalities on the New York side of the harbor into Greater New York. Cleveland Rodgers, of the City Planning Commission, and Rebecca Rankin, of the Municipal Reference Library, have collaborated to present in *New York: The World's Capital City* (Harper, 1948, pp. xviii, 398, $5.00) a handsome tribute suitable to the occasion. This tribute is more than a summary of commendable achievements; it is also a bid for recognition of the rôle of the metropolis in world affairs. In calling attention to its contribution to the United States and to the world, the authors do not gloss over the weaknesses and mistakes in the city's past and present. They admire this great city, however, and are anxious to put it in a favorable light. The political development of New York City from the little Dutch settlement on the tip of Manhattan Island to the present world metropolis is traced in the first three sections of the book. Due notice is taken of its influence on American national and New York state institutions. In the remaining six sections of the volume, in which the authors deal with the major aspects of modern city life, strict chronological presentation is wisely avoided. The reader is carried back repeatedly to the early settlers as the writers trace the evolution of the transportation system, of the patterns of land ownership and of building design, of the housekeeping functions, of the housing problem, and of the educational system. Sections are devoted to the development of Wall Street and of the communication industry (also of magazines and newspaper publishing, radio-broadcasting, etc.). Through the whole account, the authors weave their main theme, which is that this city has achieved its greatness through self-discipline and collective, democratic action, and that this achievement is its contribution and its message to the world. Particular stress is placed on the individualistic character of most of the great reforms in the city's life. They freely admit that unbridled individualism produced most of the problems in the first instance, but they argue that from vigorous individuals came the inspiration and the techniques of correction. One gains the impression from the work that the government, typically, was not pushed into solutions by widely popular protest, but was led into them by forceful individuals. The book is studded with thumbnail biographies of the great fathers of the city's public and private institutions—Andrew H. Green, J. P. Morgan, Louis Horowitz, Stanford White, Carr V. Van Anda, Robert Moses, and many others. If one considers the vast sums invested, the power and capacity of the private interests concerned, the anonymity and rootlessness of the population, it really is

remarkable that New York City has been able to control its own destinies in the public interest as well as it has. Its record certainly is as good as, if not better, than that of any other major city in the land. New Yorkers admittedly have demonstrated that it is possible, without complete suffocation, to crowd more persons into less space than anyone hitherto believed feasible. This little space even has its attractions—a park here, a sparkling personality there. But that it is habitable without the loss of "any essential freedoms" is doubtful. How about the liberty not to live under other people's feet? The book is generously illustrated. It also contains a usefully annotated bibliography and a good index.—WILLIAM H. YOUNG.

For the second time in a decade, Louis H. Bean has produced a first-class work on election forecasting. Like his *Ballot Behavior* (1940), *How to Predict Elections* (Knopf, 1948, $2.50) is a model explanation of statistical techniques in terms the layman can understand. The central idea of the book is that the art (*not* the science) of political prognostication can be based soundly on the record of the past. In analyzing national political history over a ninety-year period, Bean places greatest reliance upon biennial elections to the House of Representatives. He examines with particular care the three long periods of Republican supremacy in the House and the three epochs of Democratic majority, only one of which was as long and continuous as the Republican. Business depressions, he finds, were major factors in all six shifts in party control. Among the political truisms which Bean establishes to the satisfaction of this reviewer are the following: (1) The leading candidate for President generally pulls through "on his coat-tails" to marginal House seats his fellow-partisans; in 1936, 1940, and 1944, these seats numbered from 26 to 30. (2) A Democratic presidential candidate must poll between 52 and 53 per cent of the national popular vote in order to win a majority of electoral votes. (3) Many states are better barometers of the political weather than is Maine, but even that state's returns can be used for predictions if its deviation from national norms is taken into account. (4) Democratic House losses in 1946 were about double what they would have been if the vote cast had been up to normal. (5) Over the years since the Civil War, there has been a gradual increase in Democratic strength in the House of Representatives. Toward the end of the book, Bean furnishes the reader with some counsel on how to predict the 1948 election. He recalls Mr. Truman's popularity early in 1948, and the excellent showing made by Democratic candidates in city and congressional by-elections during the second half of 1947. This trend was reversed later in 1948 when the Administration was plagued with the revolt of the Southerners over civil rights, trouble over Palestine, and Mr. Wallace's third party threat. The marginal states in the 1948 election are considered to be New York, New Jersey, Penn-

sylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Washington, and California. Believers in the separation of powers may be shocked by Bean's reminder that one possible result of the 1948 election can be a Republican President and a Democratic Congress. This interesting book has a text written in clear, intimate style, and a statistical appendix that is a gold mine of information. It is profusely illustrated with charts. A few small errors may be found, to remind us that Mr. Bean is human: the Democrats held the House eight (not six) years between 1910 and 1918; Ohio has 26 (not 25) electoral votes. Alfred A. Knopf deserves congratulations both for the timeliness of this book and for the excellence of its typography. *How to Predict Elections*, if read, digested, and applied, can provide the student of politics with a relatively simple meter to gauge political trends. It will equip him for the rôle of informed observer in the great campaigns of 1948 and after.—DEAN E. MCHENRY.

The American public, it seems, never tires of reading about the living and working routine of the men whom it elevates to the nation's highest office. In *A President Is Many Men* (Harper, 1948, pp. x, 269, $2.75), Merriman Smith, a White House newspaper correspondent for the past seven years, therefore deals with a most popular subject. The author's stated aim is "to show in human factors and in words of as few syllables as possible how the intricate twentieth-century Presidency operates." The result is a gossipy, somewhat superficially informative, account of the day-to-day life enjoyed, or suffered, as the case may be, by the President and his family. The part played by the President's immediate staff in assisting him in "the toughest job in the land" (p. 14) supplies the key to the book's title. Because the author relies to a great extent upon what he has observed directly as a newspaper man, he gives major attention to the organization and operation of the White House staff during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. The brief sketches of the individuals who are now, or have recently been, members of the White House entourage constitutes perhaps the most significant part of the book. No great secrets of state are revealed, nor is any penetrating analysis of the place of the presidency in the general scheme of governmental organization attempted. Much of the information presented is merely the "human interest," Sunday supplement type of title-tattle about life in the White House. The style is breezy and informal, and embellished with anecdotal detail. Running through the book is a note of sympathy for the man who is "always in a crowd without being part of it, much like an actor alone on a stage, standing before a large audience in the blinding glare of a thousand spotlights. . . twenty-four hours a day" (p. 4). No doubt many readers will enjoy this collection of miscellaneous facts about how a President actually lives and works. Some may even come to appreciate

more fully the tremendous burden of the office and be thereby persuaded to view a President's performance with greater tolerance and understanding.—JOSEPH E. KALLENBACH.

Professor William B. Hesseltine, in his little book, *The Rise and Fall of Third Parties* (Public Affairs Press, 1948, pp. 119, $2.50), does not undertake to present a history of third-party movements. Rather, he is trying to determine the reasons why such movements fail to become permament parts of our party system and to indicate what they should do to be successful. The Wallace party, like its predecessors, will fail, he believes, because it is merely a protest movement, an attempt to cash in on discontent with the two major parties. It will fail, he says, because its program is largely negative in character. To be successful, a third party must have a positive program. A liberal party, to be successful, must have a program of reform, research, and regionalism—with opposition to totalitarianism in all its forms and a devotion to democratic processes. In the opinion of this reviewer, Dr. Hesseltine is asking too much to demand that any political party out of power be not a protest movement. Every political party major, or minor, if it is an out party, will appeal, and must appeal, to discontent to get votes. He is mistaken, too, in saying that the Wallace Progressives do not have a positive program. They have an elaborate program, with extensive defense of democratic processes. Their chief handicap is bad timing. There is not enough discontent at this time. People are disturbed about high prices, it is true, but they would be far more discontented if prices were low and unemployment vast. The Wallaceites are also obviously handicapped, particularly at this time, by Communist support, making their defense of democracy seem insincere. Dr. Hesseltine is right in saying that while the history of new party movements in the United States is filled with warnings, there are also many suggestions, and it does not add up to a counsel of despair. Sometime the "lib-labs," as he calls them, may get together and create a new permament political movement in this country.—E. ALLEN HELMS.

Dixon Wecter's *The Age of the Great Depression, 1929–1941* (Macmillan Co., 1948, pp. xiv, 362, $5.00) is not just another volume on Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal. It is that, but it is much more. Hardly a segment of American life of the period escapes the author's notice or his penetrating comment. The causes of the Great Depression are analyzed, its social and economic effects are systematically presented, and the roots of the New Deal are traced (a number of them to Herbert Hoover). Relief measures and reform legislation are set in proper focus and evaluated. Regionalism receives enlightening discussion, particularly that of the TVA. Labor, the farmer, the aged, and other groups are considered from various angles, not simply from the standpoint of what the government did for

them. For example, in the chapter on "Youth in Search of a Chance," we are led from birth control to child labor, to delinquency, to the CCC and the NYA, to the plight of the public schools, to a stirring in the colleges and universities, to the problem of sex, and to radical testaments of youth which alarmed persons less easily aroused than Martin Dies. And in this and the other chapters the material is presented with logic and consistency and in acceptable proportions. Space is found for art, literature, music, the press, radio, recreation, and religion. The book is a masterpiece of condensation, betraying no sign that the author felt cramped at putting so much on so few pages. Mastery of his material and facility of expression doubtless explain this triumph. Other commendable features of the book are dispassion and fairness. The general public may read this volume with pleasure and profit; social scientists with admiration and perhaps a little envy.—CLAUDIUS O. JOHNSON.

The Struggle for Party Government (Program in American Civilization, University of Maryland, 1948, pp. v, 43), by E. E. Schattschneider, is a group of three essays based upon lectures delivered by the author at the University of Maryland in March, 1948. The basic theme binding these essays together is the thesis that the problems confronting American government can be solved without significant modification of existing governmental structures. The need of our time is the power to create and implement a comprehensive plan of political action in advance of a predictable catastrophe. The only agency which can effectively perform this function is the political party. The failure of parties to meet this challenge is, in part, due to our political folklore, which has emphasized political independence at the expense of party loyalty, placed a high premium upon non-partisanship, and looked with abhorrence upon the deliberate search for power. (Departments of political science are given full credit for their encouragement of such folklore.) In the second essay, "Areas of Ignorance," the author points to the complexity of the electoral system, the lack of adequate available data, and confused research in the field of party politics, as further explanation of our failure to move in the direction of responsible party government. In the final essay, "Party Reconstruction," Professor Schattschneider presents a plan to develop greater responsibility for governing, as well as electing, within our party structure. He proposes that the congressional members of a political party be given control over presidential nominations and that they, in turn, select a reasonably permanent leader-nominee. This will permit a close relationship in policy formation between the two branches, encourage active political education, and provide the voter an opportunity for the democratic choice of alternate programs. The plan is provocative, but less so than the analysis in the first two essays.—DAYTON E. HECKMAN.

James Madison, Nationalist, 1780–1787 (Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1948, pp. 484, $6.00), by Irving Brant, is the second volume of a series on the life of Madison and covers the short span of the seven years' experiment under the Articles of Confederation. The story opens with Madison's trip to Philadelphia to begin his service in the Continental Congress and ends with the entry in his journal dated May 2, 1787, stating that he was leaving New York to attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. The book is an unusually detailed account of the period as well as of the life of Madison. It is written almost entirely from primary sources and is well documented. Its thesis is that Madison was a strong and stable force in the Continental Congress and in the Virginia legislature. The pattern of his thinking in these years was nationalism. He constantly spoke of national authority, national councils, national government, national jurisdiction, national prerogatives, national supremacy, national tribunals, national executive, national administration, and supreme government. To Madison, the word "national" meant pertaining to a nation. Never in this period did he use it in the sense given it later in the constitutional controversies as meaning the opposite of "federal" government. According to the author, Madison was concerned with both national and federal government and the local authorities were to be "subordinately useful." He had worked faithfully for greater military vigor in defense of the western territories, for the division of the vast territory of Virginia, for the establishment of a system of national revenues, a consolidated public credit, the extension of inland navigation, and the regulation of commerce. But the states had continually hampered progress in these matters, and Madison had watched the slow disintegration of the national government under the Confederation because of its lack of necessary powers. The four pillars of Madison's American empire, says the author, were "independence, union, national supremacy, and republican self-government." The book, presented in chronological arrangement, is slow-moving, due to the vast amount of factual and detailed information given. No effort has been made to high-light the more significant features and revolve the story around them.—Mary Earhart Dillon.

Monographs are generally of interest to a very limited number of specialists in a particular field. An exception is L. Ethan Ellis' *Print Paper Pendulum; Group Pressure and the Price of Newsprint* (Rutgers University Press, 1948, pp. ix, 215, $3.00), which will interest students of public opinion and pressure group activity, of the conservation of natural resources, of tariff history, of the newspaper publishing business, of general economics, and of international relations. The author has had access to official documents, letters, and privately collected papers. Both the Newspaper Publishers Association and officials of the News Print

Service Bureau have made available to him materials which have made it possible to develop the history of the tug-of-war between the newspaper publishers and the newsprint manufacturers. The story is that of the rapid exhaustion of the domestic supply of wood pulp, the shift to Canadian markets, the efforts of the domestic producers to get tariff protection, and the pressure of the publishers to keep the tariff on newsprint and wood pulp down so that they may buy in a cheap market. The text is fully documented, and both a bibliography and an index are included. Only one essential seems to be lacking. The volume comes to an abrupt close with a chapter on "Efforts to Combat Depression, 1929-1936," without indicating the pendulum swings of the past dozen years, and without any general concluding chapter. The author simply states (p. 171) that "the later chapters of this account have indicated recurring periods of easier relationships, when intelligent understanding succeeded earlier bitterness. . . . " And "informed leaders of both groups have indicated belief that a live-and-let-live attitude seems to be developing."—JOHN DAY LARKIN.

The Gallup Political Almanac for 1948 (American Institute of Public Opinion, 1948, pp. 290, $4.50) is the second edition of a very valuable compilation of election statistics in the United States. In addition to the material published in the first edition of 1946, the volume provides detailed data on the results of the 1946 and 1947 elections, gubernatorial vote figures for each state back to 1928, and information on elections to be held in 1948. Additional charts and more simplified tables make it easier to follow political trends in the United States, particularly for the last twenty years. One unusual feature of the book is the presentation of election results in precentages rather than in actual votes cast. While most of the material is based upon official election returns, even these figures have been checked, where possible, for errors. The writer has included findings of public opinion polls pertaining to the voting preferences of various segments of the voting public, and also poll results believed useful to political analysts. Thus we are supplied with election figures showing that party differences are more pronounced according to voters' occupations than along sectional lines, and that in the last three presidential elections the appeal of the Democratic party was greater among younger people, and consistently greater among union members than among non-union workers, with a somewhat greater proportion from C.I.O. unions favoring the Democratic party than from A.F.L. unions. Persons interested in studying current political trends and electoral behavior can only hope that this or a similar publication will appear regularly at annual or biennial intervals, with such improvements as its frequent use may dictate.—BELLE ZELLER.

In recent months, there has been speculation, criticism, and much loose talk about the sale of surplus war property, but it has remained for James Allan Cook, in his *The Marketing of Surplus War Property* (Public Affairs Press, 1948, pp. vii, 211, $3.25), to give a detailed, technical analysis of this gigantic venture. Dr. Cook examines the nature of the problem, government policies, and the procedures and policies of the marketing organization, and gives his conclusions in respect to the success of the program. The author considers the frequent legislative changes, the short tenure of administrators, and the failure to concentrate on developing adequate marketing policies the most outstanding weaknesses of the undertaking. As a marketing expert, Dr. Cook concentrates on the inadequacy of the marketing organization. He gives special attention to the weak distributive organization, the failure of the War Assets Administration to utilize "normal channels of trade," late development of the "site sale" method, poor regional disposal operations, the over-emphasis on priority sales, and insufficient use of samples and displays His criticisms are accompanied by detailed constructive proposals for improving marketing administration. Fortunately, the author believes that the disposal program has gradually improved and that by January, 1947 (marking the end of his study) it showed promise of completing the liquidation of consumers goods and the utilization of government industrial facilities with fair success. This treatment of a major government postwar problem is a valuable addition to the literature on democratic emergency administration.—Conley H. Dillon.

In *A Study of Judicial Review in Virginia, 1789-1928* (Columbia University Press, 1947, pp. 249, $3.00), Margaret Virginia Nelson analyzes illustrative cases involving the constitutionality of statutes and administrative acts as decided by the General Court and the supreme court of appeals of Virginia in the several periods of the state's history. The author finds that the judicial veto was used sparingly in the ante-bellum period. Political realignments in the Civil War and Reconstruction years, coupled with popular distrust of the legislative branch, brought a new prominence to the judiciary as arbitrator between the ideologies of competing factions. In the third period, 1875-1902, greater use of the police power to meet problems growing out of industrial and urban expansion provoked dozens of controversies involving the scope of public authority and private rights. Detailed limitations imposed upon the legislative power by the long constitution of 1902 were responsible for an even greater amount of litigation involving constitutional questions in the final period covered by this study, 1902-1928, when the legislature was attempting to deal with broad social policies such as regulation of corporate business, public health and education, zoning, and highways. The author

concludes that in spite of its frequent use, judicial review has "exerted slight tangible influence upon the course of legislative enactment," and has "played an unimportant rôle in the shaping of vital public policies" in Virginia (p. 202). The author's concluding chapter, together with the extensive bibliography and helpful charts on the organization of the judiciary under the several Virginia constitutions, may be quite useful to students of state government who can endure the annoyance of irregular and inadequate citations, grammatical errors, and numerous misspelled words overlooked by a hasty editor.—ALDEN L. POWELL.

The Municipal Year Book, 1948 (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1948, pp. 558, $8.50 if remittance accompanies order, otherwise $9.00) is the fifteenth edition of a standard reference work whose purpose, according to the latest foreword, is "to provide municipal officials with discussions on the current problems of cities throughout the country, with facts and statistics on individual city activities, and with analyses of trends by population groups." Among the new features in this edition are data on the type of personnel organization in each city, municipal policy on employee unions, airport management and revenues, cemetery management, taxicab regulation, and sewer service charges. The finance section contains information reported by hundreds of cities on new local non-property taxes adopted in 1947, and also revenue, expenditure, and debt data for certain cities. The planning section shows the types of improvements that subdivision developers must install before plats are approved for areas both inside and outside a city. New articles on administrative research and municipal reference libraries reflect the increasing emphasis placed by municipal officials on advisory aids to better management. Because 1947 was a legislative year, with all except one state legislature meeting, more emphasis is placed on the articles summarizing developments in each field of municipal activity.—F. A. O.

In *City Manager Government in South Dakota* (Governmental Research Bureau, University of South Dakota, 1948, pp. 48), W. O. Farber, in accord with the purpose of the series in which it appears, presents for citizen use city manager government as it has arisen, developed, and now operates in four communities of that state. There is the usual problem of defining what constitutes city manager government, and, in South Dakota, as in other instances, this problem is not made easier by the growing up of governments prior to legislative planning. One of these communities, Clark, population 1,314, has council-manager government by ordinance and not only represents the experience of a small community with manager government, but has had experience for a comparatively long period, i.e., since 1912. The other three, Aberdeen, Madison, and Rapid City, have

the commission-manager type, rather recently adopted. The author is brief in his analysis of the day-to-day operations of these governments, but he has courageously undertaken the difficult task of appraisal of results. He finds specific gains dubiously attributable to manager government, but generally concludes that "the record of manager government in South Dakota is not one to contradict the favorable experience elsewhere." "For the most part, action and accomplishment have characterized manager government" in the state.—H. C. Cook.

In his *The Problem of Government in the San Francisco Bay Region* (Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley, 1948, pp. iv, 163), John C. Bollens contributes a valuable study in the comparatively recent field of metropolitan government. It is worthy of note that the San Francisco region has typical metropolitan problems and, in addition, problems peculiar to its own geographic identity. The geographic, social, and economic characteristics of the region are carefully analyzed. The multiple governmental complex in the eight counties includes 69 cities, one city-county, 222 special purpose districts, 383 school districts, and 16 special assessment districts, for a total of 699 governmental entities. The resultant problems of transportation, waste disposal, water supply, fire and police protection, and recreation are presented carefully. Popular control is complicated, if not rendered ineffective, by the complex of personalities and issues thrust before the electorate periodically. Efforts at simplification are carefully analyzed, together with the legal obstacles, Maps, charts, and tabular presentations are excellent. This monograph should constitute required reading for the student of municipal and local government.—David W. Knepper.

Teachers of municipal government and of political parties will welcome the reissue of Lincoln Steffens' famous muck-raking essays, *The Shame of the Cities* (New York: Peter Smith, 1948, pp. 306, $3.50). The library copies of this minor classic in American local politics have long ago become dog-eared from constant use. Many young political scientists have made their first acquaintance with the politics of bosses and boodle through the pages of Steffens' work. Some have even acquired from this time-tested catalyst their first sense of moral indignation and their first zeal for political reform. American city government has advanced a long way since Steffens' exposures, but much of what he found may still be found in St. Louis, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Chicago, and New York.—William H. Young.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Teachers of foreign government have been hard put to it in recent years to find suitable texts for their students. To meet the need for a text which

is up to date, Philip W. Buck and John W. Masland, in *The Governments of Foreign Powers* (Henry Holt and Co., 1947, pp. viii, 439, $3.25), describe, as of January, 1947, the governments of England, France, the Soviet Union, Italy, Germany, Japan, and China. The emphasis is upon contemporary government. At a time when fresh and recent texts are scarce, teachers of comparative government must be grateful that this volume is available. It may be noted, however, that approximately 102 pages are devoted to England, 50 to France, 49 to the Soviet Union, 30 to Italy, 25 to Germany, 81 to Japan, and 62 to China. This brevity of treatment is posited upon the authors' attempt "to give a simple but accurate description" (p. v) of the governments selected; but in this attempt they have been constrained to make statements such as the following: "In a text such as this, any review of English constitutional history must be brutally condensed" (p. 13); "A single chapter can do no more than suggest the subtlety of the many interlocking relationships in the practice of English cabinet government" (p. 44); "It is hardly possible in a chapter to more than sketch the machinery of the courts" (p. 92). If this volume is no more than a "sketch" of foreign governments, it must be remembered that the authors set for themselves a difficult task, namely, the description of distant governments in a process of change. The work is accurate as far as it goes, and the simplicity aspired to is realized. Supplemented by newspaper and periodical material and by judicious use of the suggested readings appended to each chapter, this text should be of considerable value to classes in comparative government.—C. Gordon Post.

Howard Robinson's *The British Post Office; A History* (Princeton University Press, 1948, pp. 467, $7.50) offers the unusual combination of systematic, meticulous scholarship with the interest of a well-written, intelligently organized travel book. For a study which would synthesize the political, economic, and social development of a nation, one could hardly find a more fitting subject than the evolution of the British postal system. Why, in Britain and the Dominions, is the postal service still known as the "Royal Mail?" Beginning essentially as an agency to ensure that the king's messengers (and hence his rule) could function effectively, the postal service evolved from a vital necessity to the upper crust of the economic classes to (under Rowland Hill and his contemporaries) a major factor in the dissemination of public information and popular education. Administratively, we see the conflict between the noble lord, who holds, in the conduct of the Post Office, a lucrative perquisite, and the "private enterprise" of the astute business man, who aims to afford a paying service to his colleagues. Both lose out to the growing conviction that an essentially public function is involved; in the process, the most effective ideas of private promoters are taken over by the government. The development of means of transportation, needless to say, holds a prominent place in the

narrative—the postboys, the stage and mail coaches, the improvement and extension of highways, the advent of the railroad, the popular expressions of alarm at each innovation. The climax of the story is the achievement in 1840 of Rowland Hill's triple reform—universal penny postage, prepayment of mail, and the adhesive stamp. But probably the most striking feature is the long history of developments, of individual initiative and continued effort, which built up to that climax. In addition to an adequate bibliography and references to his authorities, the author has contributed immensely to the effectiveness of his story by including a wealth of graphic material—thirty-six well chosen plates of historic interest, numerous maps of postal routes, and scores of facsimile postmarks and similar data. All told, it is an admirable performance.—A. GORDON DEWEY.

The already formidable galaxy of books and articles dealing with the various resistance movements during World War II has received a further addition in Hans Rothfels' *The German Opposition to Hitler* (Hinsdale, Ill.: Henry Regnery Co., 1948, pp. 172). The book deals with the history of the conspiracy against Hitler which culminated in the abortive attempt of July 20, 1944. To the facts already known from the books by Dulles, Gisevius, and Schlabrendorff, as well as a number of articles in periodical literature, the book under review adds but little of great significance. The author serves a meritorious cause in pointing out clearly that the opposition to Hitler did not start merely when military defeat began to rear its head, but actually commenced in the days of apparent Nazi triumphs. He also shows clearly that this was not merely a "general's revolt" organized by a small clique of malcontents, as tendentious comments still have it, but that it involved a surprisingly large number of people of heterogeneous origins and convictions—a fact which this reviewer has found to be true. The author further merits approval by going beyond the mere military and conspiratorial aspects of the plot and throwing what light there is on the political and ideological intentions of the conspirators—even if only to show the lack of unity pervailing among the inner circle. So far, so good. But in his laudable ardor, the author sometimes falls overboard and is replaced by the advocate of a cause. Thus he surrounds the wavering generals with an aura of high virtue which does not always seem justified, seeing in them only the regeneration of that "best" Prussian spirit of devotion to highest moral duty—an interpretation which is likely to cause raised eye-brows here and there. He also accepts too readily the assertions of the "inner emigration" and claims for the resistance such questionable, semi-criminal organizations as the "Edelweiss-Piraten." Nevertheless it is an interesting book, to be read

with some caution and only by the initiated, as its mass of details and names will hardly appeal to the novice.—ROBERT G. NEUMANN.

Russell H. Fitzgibbon and his editorial colleagues have added a substantial contribution to the basic reference collections in the field of comparative government by publishing the only complete compilation in English since 1909 of the constitutions of the countries of the Western Hemisphere (*The Constitutions of the Americas*, University of Chicago Press, 1948, pp. xx, 847, $10.00). This is a volume which has been sorely needed and which will be welcomed immediately for its value in research and teaching. It is a thoroughly scholarly production, accurate in technical details, and edited to provide maximum convenience in use. Although the volume is primarily a reference work, it includes a well-written and penetrating introduction by Professor Fitzgibbon (based on his article on constitutional development in Latin America in this REVIEW, June, 1945). The short bibliographies on general and particular constitutional sources for each country summarize the standard works. The constitutions include those of the United States, Canada, and the Latin American countries as of January 1, 1948. In translation of the non-English documents, the editors tend to emphasize literal rather than free rendition and frequently follow translation of key works and phrases by insertion, in parentheses, of the same words in the original language. Fitzgibbon's lexicon of Latin American constitutional terms ("Glossary of Latin American Constitutional Terms," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, August, 1947) could profitably have been included in an appendix, and should be considered, space permitting, for future revisions. Frequent changes in the instruments of government characterize Latin American constitutional organization, and this reference work should be revised occasionally in accordance with such changes or supplemented by the issuance of periodic addenda.—WILLIAM S. STOKES.

The universal tendency toward the "service state" has resulted everywhere in both conflict and coöperation between local and central authorities. In his study, *British Block Grants and Central-Local Finance* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXV, Number 1, 1947, pp. xiv, 222, $2.50), Reynold E. Carlson has examined the British attempt to devise a scheme that would encourage local efficiency and enterprise and at the same time provide needed aid from the Exchequer to those localities less able to bear the cost of the services. This scheme is the donation of a fixed annual sum to the local authority without conditions as to its use. It was established by the Local Government Act of 1929 and replaced the haphazard system of allocated

grants which had been accumulating for generations. Professor Carlson has investigated the effect of block grants upon local government finances and has concluded that . . . "the first objective . . . to bring central aid more in proportion to local needs has not been achieved by a substantial margin." Block grants have proved so insufficient that *ad hoc* percentage grants are again appearing and municipal rates have been climbing steadily. The author notes further that the emphasis is no longer on the relative duties of central and local governments, but rather upon the power, legal and fiscal, to undertake the services. The long-range tendency is to transfer more and more authority to the Exchequer, which alone can provide the funds needed for reconstruction and the greatly expanded services currently planned. This study will be useful to students of government finance and to those interested in the dynamics of central-local relations. It brings up to date much of the material in Miss Newcomer's book, *Central and Local Finance in Germany and England*, published in 1937. The appendices include one making comparisons with parallel developments in Germany during the Nazi régime.—MORLEY AYEARST.

In writing *Lord Macaulay's Legislative Minutes* (India Branch, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1946 [U.S., 1948], pp. 312, $6.00), C. D. Dharker prepared a volume important for students of Macaulay himself, of India, and of the English reform movement of the 1830's. He publishes for the first time a substantial selection from Thomas Babington Macaulay's minutes prepared as the first law member of the India Council under the India Act of 1883. The minutes reveal Macaulay as a lucid, detailed, orderly writer concerned, like his guides, Mill and Bentham with attacking privilege, whether British or Brahmin. His administrative and judicial reforms reflected the liberal individualism of the early nineteenth century. Dharker writes in a clear, well documented style. His discussion of Macaulay's accomplishments is detailed and exacting. About half of the book is Dharker's commentary on Macaulay; the rest is the Macaulay minutes.—GARLAND DOWNUM.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

The Year Book of World Affairs, 1948 (London: Stevens and Sons, Ltd., 1948, pp. 376, 20s.), edited by George W. Keeton and Georg Schwarzenberger, is the second annual volume to be published under the auspices of the London Institute of World Affairs. It contains eleven substantial articles by recognized authorities, and excellent reviews of more than seventy books. The three most significant essays deal with topics in the field of international law, the special province of the editors. In a penetrating but cautious commentary on "The Judgment of Nuremberg," Georg Schwarzenberger warns against "attributing undue significance to the

judgment" because of "the incongruity between parts of the Tribunal's Charter and the present state of world organization" (p. 121). Yuen-Li Liang, director of the United Nations Division on the Development and Codification of International Law, discusses with admirable clarity the problems and prospects of promoting the work he is supervising, with particular reference to the nature and use of multipartite instruments. The analysis of "The Soviet Concept of International Law," by L. B. Schapiro, is informative and realistic. The leading article in the volume—"The Future of British Foreign Policy," by George W. Keeton—portrays the world setting in which British policy must operate, with considerable attention to the question of the closer integration of Western Europe and to the objectives of Soviet and American policies. Moritz J. Bonn contributes some interesting reflections on the latter topic; he believes that "there will be no war as long as they [the United States] remain firm" (p. 42). Geoffrey Goodman's sympathetic survey of the work of UNRRA opens with the startling assertion that "UNRRA was the first genuinely international organization which has worked effectively for the benefit of mankind' (p. 197). The remaining articles discuss the diverse subjects of "Japan, "Colour Problems of South Africa, "The European Economic Organizations," "The Security Council in Action," and "Moral Standards in International Relations." On the whole, the volume maintains enviably high standards. It should be of interest to all serious students of world affairs.—NORMAN D. PALMER.

An over-all view of the European (excluding the Soviet Union) economic situation is given in *A Survey of the Economic Situation and Prospects of Europe* (United Nations, 1948, pp. xvi, 206). The presentation, largely statistical, is divided into four parts: (1) the recovery in production; (2) the recovery in trade; (3) the balance of payments; and (4) the problems of European reconstruction. The recovery in production has been most marked. Excluding Germany and the Soviet Union, industrial production had reached the prewar level in 1947, although the gains were mostly in the heavy industries. Production in consumer goods industries was appreciably below the prewar level, as was agricultural production. The foreign trade of European countries, both in respect to each other and to oversea countries, has lagged in its recovery. In addition, the nature of the trade has been altered. A decline in intra-European trade in foodstuffs and raw materials has taken place, increasing Europe's dependence on oversea supplies. The huge deficit in the oversea balance of payments is considered the most critical feature of Europe's current economic situation. A restoration of equilibrium in the balance of payments, it is stated, "will not be possible without vast changes in the structure of the European economy." Among the problems of reconstruction discussed are (1) the problem of

inflation, (2) the problem of intra-European trade, and (3) the problem of production. Economic reconstruction of Europe to its prewar standards not only will require great effort, but also will necessitate a changed pattern of production and trade. What amounts to a mild revolution in economic relationships will have to take place.—NATHAN L. SILVERSTEIN.

In his revised edition of *International Government* (Ronald Press Co., 1948, pp. xx, 554, $5.00), Professor Clyde Eagleton gives us an excellent piece of work that will meet a long-felt need for a satisfactory textbook in introductory courses in international organization. The author traces the development of international organization and international law from the very beginning down to the present and looks into the future in terms of regional agreements and world government. Also considerable emphasis is placed upon the growth of the administrative, legislative, and judicial functions of international organization. This is followed by a brief treatment of the League of Nations and its activities, the United Nations, and specialized international agencies. The analysis of the problem of war and obstacles in the way of preventing war are treated with clarity and understanding. The author is strongly in favor of effective international government and declares that the United States must assume the leadership among the nations of the world to make this a reality. He is a bit skeptical, however, as to how far this country will go in assuming such leadership. A practical system of world government, he declares, will probably be based upon the federal principle, although something new may ultimately be developed through experimentation in international organization. The book is heavily documented, which adds materially to its value for anyone interested in pursuing farther the wide range of subjects covered by the author. In addition, there is an extensive bibliography; and in the appendix are included the most important documents of international organization.—CARL M. FRASURE.

The Far East (Prentice-Hall, 1948, pp. xxi, 862, $7.65), by Paul Hibbert Clyde, is a welcome addition to the texts now appearing on the Far East. The historian will find the work comprehensive and scholarly; the specialist in international relations will find it valuable in giving perspective on the difficult problem of the contemporary Far East. The author has placed his emphasis on Japan and China, although brief consideration is given to the Soviet Far East and Southeast Asia. The division of the book into 256 pages on the Far East up to 1894 and 544 pages on the area up to the summer of 1947 reveals the present emphasis on developments in the twentieth century. The interpretation of postwar developments in the Far East is judicious, although time alone will permit a more definitive evaluation of the momentous impact of the West on Eastern

Asia, especially as a consequence of the recent war. The forty-three maps in the book will prove a valuable asset to most students whose geographical knowledge of Asia is somewhat limited. The chapters of the text are well footnoted, and the bibliography at the end of the book, arranged by chapters, contains brief comments on the best publications relating to the field. In the last chapter of his book, Professor Clyde predicts that the United Nations "will be tested as severely in the Far East as in Europe;" and one cannot read this able text on developments in the Far East without agreeing.—RUSSELL H. FIFIELD.

One of the most valuable papers to appear on the subject of foreign aid is Laura Metzger's *American Loans in the Postwar Period* (Foundation for Foreign Affairs, 1948, pp. viii, 60, $0.50). This pamphlet achieves the high standard of its predecessors in the Foundation's series. A basis of the survey is the analysis of errors and lack of realism in the American foreign aid program from 1945 to 1947. The author then discusses various forms of direct lending, especially the Export-Import Bank's activities and the British loan. The rôle and inadequacies of the World Bank are examined; and a short but pertinent chapter is included on Greek-Turkish aid. Attention is given also to the inadequately-publicised matter of disposal of American Army surplus goods. The study contains many cogent remarks and inferences about the ERP and possible future lending programs. It is made plain that the Marshall Plan did not represent a new phase of American opinion, but was a development on a vaster scale from 1945–47 experience. The conclusions include the point that the long-range problem is one not of trade, but of markets. Therefore, while the new aid program may meet the reconstruction needs of the recipient nations, genuine economic salvation or peace may depend on a truly progressive international approach, including comparable assistance to under-developed areas throughout the world.—J. WILLIAM ROBINSON.

Twelve professors from ten American colleges and universities have pooled their efforts under the leadership of Floyd A. Cave, of San Francisco State College, to produce a symposium on contemporary world history. The book is entitled *The Origins and Consequences of World War II* (Dryden Press, 1948, pp. xxvi, 820, $4.75). It is divided into two main parts. The first, and by far the longer, deals with the origins and the second with the consequences of the war. The scope of the book is somewhat broader than is indicated by its title. Except that it omits systematic analysis of military operations in war, its pattern does not greatly deviate from that made familiar by such works as those of Benns and Langsam. Characteristically enough, it begins with a chapter on the roots of the First World War. Traditional but nevertheless competent treatment is

accorded in a chapter each to such subjects as the Versailles Conference, the League of Nations, the Soviet Union, and Fascist Italy. The book is brought up to date with chapters on Great Power rivalries after the Second World War and the United Nations. In addition to his duties as editor, Professor Cave has written six of the chapters on Continental Europe. W. Leon Godshall wrote the two chapters on the Far East, and Harold E. Davis the two which deal with the international affairs of the Americas. Other contributors include Glenn S. Dumke, Emil Lengyel, George Waskovich, James L. Glanville, Raymond C. Cowherd, Oscar G. Darlington, Charles A. McClelland, and Raymond E. Lindgren. One of the more stimulating chapters is by Stefan T. Possony on the military causes of the two world wars. He draws the conclusion that at the outbreak of the Second World War there was, from the numerical point of view, no reason why the French and British air forces should not have overcome the *Luftwaffe*. They failed, and a factor in the failure was the inadequate ground and maintenance organization.—RALPH A. NOREM.

Mr. Geoffrey Crowther's *The Economic Reconstruction of Europe* (Claremont College, 1948, pp. ix, 79, $2.75) is a contribution to the debate on ECA, investment or "Operation Rathole." In the first lecture, Mr. Crowther strikes a note of optimism which pervades all his remarks. Europe is on the road to recovery, and we should not be too impatient or expect too much. In the second lecture, he argues that European nationalism and socialism are not insurmountable obstacles to reconstruction. Some socialism is natural, and national states can be self-supporting again. In the long run, of course, the solution must be a Western European Federation. The third lecture relates America's part in European reconstruction. This volume suffers from the natural limitations of the lecture as a medium of mature discussion. The conclusions reached are plausible, and one appreciates their optimism; yet they are based upon some questionable assumptions. They assume, without examining the difficulties, a satisfactory solution of the German problem. They accept a divided Europe—the whole discussion deals almost exclusively with Western Europe. They assume that the problems of Europe stem from the war rather than from the basic forces which were responsible for the armed conflict. Mr. Crowther has necessarily left much unsaid or half-said, and one might take issue with these fundamental omissions or undeveloped assumptions.—LAWRENCE PELLETIER.

"Definitely directed at the leadership groups within all communities, large and small," Thomas R. Adams' *Education for International Understanding* (Institute of Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1948, pp. viii, 181, $2.00) falls short of its aim in that its lan-

guage too often is academic and lofty, its organization of material is confusing and unsystematic, and its presentation of subject-matter is obscured by "patter" and verbosity. There is a lack of concise and precise phraseology. Too much effort is required to read, re-read, and comprehend the concepts advanced. The book will appeal, and possibly be useful, only to a limited group of people who are so advanced in the techniques and mechanics of adult education as to be in little need of it.—W. LEON GODSHALL.

POLITICAL THEORY AND MISCELLANEOUS

A real contribution to the field of legal education in the United States has been made by Esther Lucile Brown in *Lawyers, Law Schools, and the Public Service* (Russell Sage Foundation, 1948, pp. 258, $3.00). The book is an outgrowth of the author's visits to twenty-three law schools throughout the country selected for study upon a "cross section" basis. Miss Brown also spent considerable time in Washington analyzing the part taken by lawyers in the governing process in the executive branch. The monograph is divided into three parts: "Important Rôle Played by Lawyers in Official Positions"; "Nature of Work Done by Lawyers in Federal Agencies"; and "Implications for Legal Education." Two-thirds of the volume is devoted to the last part. The writer shows surprise at her own findings respecting the number of lawyers in the executive branch of the government, the diversity of work which they perform, and the importance of their contribution. (Incidently, her summary of the different categories of legal work in the government will be helpful to pre-legal and legal students who are interested in the possibility of a career in the public service.) A knowledge of administrative law is also important, Miss Brown points out, for the private practitioner who increasingly finds himself handling cases before the great administrative tribunals and other agencies of the executive branch. The law schools are, in general, failing miserably to meet the new situation and continue to offer courses which teach "the law" as if the government scarcely existed, and in order that their graduates may win cases rather than understand social justice. She commends some worthy experiments under way to broaden legal education to include more emphasis upon social needs and governmental procedures, but such effort is too little and almost too late. The chief hurdle seems to be the failure of the legal profession to realize what must be done and the tendency of law-school administrators and teachers to be complacent or defeatist. This monograph should help them to see the problem and stimulate them to act.—WALLACE BREWSTER.

Political and social scientists will be grateful for Professor Louis Hartz' excellent study, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought; Pennsylvania, 1776–1860* (Harvard University Press, 1948. pp. xii, 366, $4.00). It is one

of four similar inquiries sponsored by the Social Science Research Council's committee on research in economic history. Taking Pennsylvania as a test case, Dr. Hartz shows how mythical is the still widespread view that the period from 1776 to 1860 was one of *laissez faire* dominance in theory and practice for state governments in the United States. He effectively demonstrates how active and leading a rôle the state of Pennsylvania played in the development of its resources and enterprises during this era through its business charter program, its joint ownership of mixed corporations, its public works system, and its regulation of economic activities, such as corporate enterprise, slavery, labor, liquor trade, and debtor-creditor relations. Then he explains how this pattern of state intervention and control was supplanted by one of far more restricted state action just before the outbreak of the Civil War, partly as a result of state bankruptcy and administrative failure in public enterprises, partly as a consequence of attacks by pressure groups adversely affected by state activity, *e.g.*, the liquor interests and the Pennsylvania Railroad. The political victory of the anti-state group led after the Civil War to the creation of a false *laissez faire* image of the antebellum past, of strategic utility to the triumphant big business interest. Sound and valuable as this work is, some points of omission deserve attention. I regret that Professor Hartz did not correlate the rôle of Pennsylvania's representatives in the national government in this period with his findings on intrastate matters. I also wish that he had made fuller identification of key individuals, given more detailed accounts of specific pressure groups, made greater use of economic theory, and presented more searching analysis of the social factors that molded public opinion, policy, and practice.—SIDNEY RATNER.

Arthur M. Weimer and Homer Hoyt's *Principles of Urban Real Estate* (Ronald Press Co., 1948, pp. xiv, 512, $4.75) presents a revised edition of a college textbook designed for courses in real estate and land economics. Part I of the book deals with the central theme of real estate values and the factors which tend to cause value changes. Though the volume is admittedly concerned with the economic approach to the problem of real estate, the political scientist will find interesting materials concerning the causes and stages of city growth, types of cities, methods of city expansion, pattern of land use, methods of analyzing future growth, and the dynamics of neighborhoods and districts. The chapter on regulations proposes some of the more standard solutions to the general property tax evil, and discusses planning, zoning, building codes, subsidies, and government ownership. The presentation of problems involved in the valuation of property should appeal to the layman and the public administrator as well as the student of real estate. Part II of the book is concerned chiefly with the policies and operations of persons and enterprises engaged in the

real estate business. Here, governmental agencies are described as establishing the "rules of the game" within which private firms and individuals operate. The last quarter of the book contains appendices, which include an article on the use of statistical data, a table of real estate licensing laws in the several states, and tables on annuity valuations, but it is chiefly devoted to "study projects" or case studies coördinated with the chapters. The authors are critical of ill-conceived and obsolete city plans, zoning regulations, building codes, tax systems, licensing laws, legal forms and processes, and title search systems. These are subjects of criticism by political scientists too. The authors' attitude about the value and need of well conceived and properly revised and administered governmental controls does not seem to warrant the criticism leveled against the first edition.—DONOVAN F. EMCH.

Louisiana State University and the trustees of the Littlefield Fund for Southern History at the University of Texas are jointly publishing a series of ten volumes representing "a full and impartial study of the South and its part in American history" from the seventeenth century to the present day. *The Development of Southern Sectionalism, 1819–1848* (1948, pp. xxii, 400, $6.00), by Charles S. Sydnor, professor of history at Duke University, is volume five in the projected series. It covers a most significant period in our history, years packed with emotional tension, as the South receded from the dominant rôle in national politics into the position of conscious sectional minority. Professor Sydnor details an account of internal developments and federal relations through a third of a century, but his technique is analytical rather than chronological. Political events appear in perspective against the changing background of social and economic conditions which profoundly altered the mental outlook of the South and caused it to repudiate the democratic creed of the Virginia dynasty. In the mid-nineteenth century, Southern statesmen talked less about the rights of man, argued more about constitutional law, and substituted allegiance to the section for patriotism to the nation. The church, the schools, and even literature, were imbued with "local color" to affirm the perfection of a sectional system based on slavery. Authenticated with an excellent critical essay on source materials, this is an outstanding piece of Southern historical scholarship; written in good literary style, it can be enjoyed by the lay as well as the academic reader.—MARIAN D. IRISH.

Herbert S. Allan's *John Hancock: Patriot in Purple* (Macmillan Co., 1948, pp. xiv, 422, $6.00) is the most comprehensive and fully documented biography of Hancock that has yet appeared. John Adams once prophesied that such an account would never be written; and the probable reason for his remark becomes apparent to a reader of this book. The evidence

left by John Hancock's contemporaries with regard to their estimate of his character is either so laudatory or so condemnatory that it often leads Mr. Allan to an explanation that the truth must lie somewhere between two extremes. The net result is a somewhat indistinct portrait of the man. The style of the book is often florid. Inconsequential errors and misleading statements with respect to the time of meeting and the composition of the Annapolis and Philadelphia conventions are noted (p. 326). A bibliography is appended.—J. S. G. CARSON.

In *Gene Debs; The Story of a Fighting American* (International Publishers, 1948, pp. 128, $1.50), Herbert M. Morais and William Cahn render a service to those who may wish to draw a better perspective of the labor movement of our times, by presenting in easy style and exciting fashion the devotion and contributions of a truly great leader to labor's interests more than a generation ago. The work can hardly be regarded as a biography. It is incomplete, sketchy, dramatizing particularly the events of the Great Northern Railway strike, the Pullman strike, the Debs campaigns for the presidency, and his imprisonment in the Atlanta penitentiary. In it there is nothing new, but its readable style makes it a contribution for the popular reader.—H. C. COOK.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF POLITICAL INTEREST

CHARLES B. HAGAN

AND

J. AUSTIN RANNEY

University of Illinois

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC LAW

Books and Pamphlets

Andrews, Bert. Washington witch hunt. Pp. 218. N. Y.: Random. 1948.

Bachman, George W., and Meriam, Lewis. The issue of compulsory health insurance. Pp. 280. Washington [D. C.]: Brookings Inst. 1948.

Bean, Louis H. How to predict elections. Pp. 206. N. Y.: Knopf. 1948.

Blinken, Donald M. Wool tariffs and American policy. Pp. 180. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1948.

Cannon, Clarence, comp. Democratic manual of the Democratic National Convention. Pp. 44. Washington: 1948.

Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr., and Eberhart, Sylvia. American opinion on world affairs in the atomic age. Pp. 173. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press. 1948.

Fairbank, John King. The U. S. and China. Pp. 398. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press. 1948.

Fairman, Charles. American constitutional decisions. Pp. 467. N. Y.: Holt. 1948.

Gallup political almanac for 1948. Pp. 612. Princeton: Am. Institute of Public Opinion. 1948.

Goodbar, Joseph E., and Bergeron, Lorenzo U. A creative capitalism. Pp. 380. Boston: Boston Univ. Press. 1948.

Graham, Malbone W. American diplomacy in the international community. Pp. 279. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1948.

Hesseltine, William Best. Lincoln and the war governors. Pp. 437. N. Y.: Knopf. 1948.

Hiss, Donald. U. S. participation in the U. N. Pp. 47. N. Y.: Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. 1947.

Hull, Cordell. The memoirs of Cordell Hull. 2 vols. Pp. 1822. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Jelenko, Victor. Bring politics into our schools; a plan for enduring peace. Pp. 116. Baltimore: Society to Promote Education for Democratic Citizenship. 1948.

Kerwin, Jerome, ed. Civil-military relationships in American life. Pp. 192. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1948.

Killingsworth, Charles C. State labor relations acts. Pp. 337. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1948.

Kise, Joseph, and *Sjoselius, George B.* Minnesota, the state and its government. Pp. 87. Moorhead [Minn.]: 1948.

Lovett, Robert Morss. All our years; the autobiography of Robert Morss Lovett. Pp. 383. N. Y.: Viking. 1948.

Lyons, Eugene. Our unknown ex-president; a portrait of Herbert Hoover. Pp. 340. Garden City [N. Y.]: Doubleday. 1948.

MacIver, Robert M. The more perfect union; a program for the control of intergroup discrimination in the U. S. Pp. 317. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Metzger, Laure. American loans in the postwar period. Pp. 60. Washington: Foundation for Foreign Affairs. 1948.

Morais, Herbert M., and Cahn, William. Gene Debs: the story of a fighting American. Pp. 128. N. Y.: Int'l Publishers. 1948.

Newman, James R., and Miller, Byron S. The control of atomic energy; a study of its social, economic, and political implications. Pp. 447. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1948.

N. Y. State Bar Assn. Robinson-Patman Act symposium. Pp. 157. N. Y.: Commerce Clearing House. 1948.

Parsons, Wilfrid. The first freedom: considerations on church and state in the U. S. Pp. 190. N. Y.: D. X. McMullen. 1948.

Pleasants, Samuel A. Fernando Wood of N. Y. Pp. 216. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1948.

Reede, Arthur H. Adequacy of workmen's compensation. Pp. 422. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press. 1948.

Reitzel, William. The Mediterranean: its rôle in America's foreign policy. Pp. 195. N. Y.: Harcourt. 1948.

Savelle, Max. Seeds of liberty: the genesis of the American mind. Pp. 637. N. Y.: Knopf. 1948.

Schuyler, William M. ed. The American yearbook. Pp. 1148. N. Y.: Nelson. 1948.

Smith, A. Merriman. A president is many men. Pp. 279. N. Y.: Harper. 1948.

Stocking, George W., and Watkins, Myron W. Cartels or competition? Pp. 530. N. Y.: Twentieth Century Fund. 1948.

Stoddard, Henry L. Presidential sweepstakes: the story of political conventions and campaigns. Pp. 224. N. Y.: Putnam. 1948.

Welles, Sumner. We need not fail. Pp. 157. Boston: Houghton. 1948.

White, Leonard D. The federalists: a study in administrative history. Pp. 550. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Wise, James W. Meet Henry Wallace. Pp. 91. N. Y.: Boni and Gaer. 1948.

Articles

Administration. Organization and administration of the United States atomic energy commission. *Richard O. Niehoff.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. The veterans administration in transition. *Gladys M. Kammerer.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. A technique for controlling quality. *William R. Divine* and *Harvey Sherman.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. Public employment service: functions and operations. *Collis Stocking.* Mo. Labor Rev. June, 1948.

———. Problems of administrative regionalization. *William G. Torpey.* Soc. Sci. July, 1948.

Administrative Law. An examination of the Tennessee law of administrative procedure. *George S. Boone.* Vanderbilt Law Rev., Apr., 1948.

———. Judicial characteristics of administrative regulation. *John Dickinson.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Administrative rules—interpretative, legislative and retroactive. *Kenneth Culp Davis.* Yale Law Jour. Apr., 1948.

———. Judicial review under the administrative procedure act—in which judicial offspring receive a congressional confirmation. *Alfred Long Scanlan.* Notre Dame Lawyer. May, 1948.

———. Non-reviewable administrative action. *Kenneth Culp Davis.* Univ. of Pa. Law Rev., June, 1948.

———. Presidential subdelegation of administrative authority in wartime. II: World War II. *Nathan D. Grundstein.* Geo. Wash. Law Rev. Apr., June, 1948.

Admiralty. A decade of admiralty in the supreme court of the U. S. *Edwin D. Dickinson and William S. Andrews, Jr.* Calif. Law Rev. June, 1948.

Bill of Rights. Procedural safeguards in the bill of rights. *William O. Douglas.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Society. Apr., 1948.

———. The Jehovah's witnesses cases. *William A. Elias, Jr.* Univ. of Kansas City Law Rev. Apr.–June, 1948.

———. The bill of rights, the fourteenth amendment, and the supreme court. *John Raeburn Green.* Mich. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Search and seizure. *Edgar J. Stephens, Jr.* Miss. Law Jour. May, 1948.

———. "Peace of mind in 48 pieces vs. uniform right of privacy. *Frederick J. Ludwig.* Minn. Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. Subversive of what? *Julian P. Boyd.* Atlantic. Aug., 1948.

Business Regulation. Definiteness and particularity in patent claims. *William Redin Woodward.* Mich. Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Trademark protection of American firms in Argentina. *John Wolff.* Geo. Wash. Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Social implications of the small loan laws of the U. S. *Robert W. Kelso.* Modern Law Rev., Apr., 1948.

———. The patent system: II. *Symposium.* Law and Contemp. Probs. Spring, 1948.

———. Restraint of trade—employees or enterprisers? *Milton M. Gottesman.* Univ. of Chicago Law Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. Public utility labor problems. *Clarence M. Updegraff.* Iowa Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Copyright law and the modern dance arrangement. *John H. Merryman.* Notre Dame Lawyer. May, 1948.

———. Policy issues in international air transportation. *Oswald Ryan.* Geo. Wash. Law Rev., June, 1948.

———. Patents: practical considerations. *I. Jordan Kunik.* Conn. Bar Jour., June, 1948.

———. Insurance—the regulation phase. *David D. Berdon.* Conn. Bar Jour., June, 1943.

———. Oleomargarine—pattern for state trade barriers. *Eugene O. Porter.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. June, 1948.

———. Negotiated versus competitive debt financing. *Ralph S. Peterson.* Vanderbilt Law Rev., June, 1948.

———. The SEC and the broker-dealer. *Louis Loss.* Vanderbilt Law Rev., June, 1948.

———. The electric industry looks to the future. *Charles E. Oakes.* Pub. Util. Fort. June 3, 1948.

———. Free enterprise and the utilities. *Earl O. Shreve.* Pub. Util. Fort., June 3, 1948.

———. The early days of the rural electrification idea: 1914–1936. *Morris L. Cooke.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. U. S. copyright act: anti-monopoly provisions need some revision. *Sam Bass Warner.* Am. Bar Assn. Jour. June, 1948.

———. The Shasta power controversy. *Jane Eshleman Conant.* Public Util. Fort. July 1, 1948.

———. Relation of security regulation to market timing. *J. Louis Donnelly.* Pub. Util. Fort., July 1, 1948.

———. What are air mail costs? *David S. Stanley.* Pub. Util. Fort. July 1, 1948.

———. Statistical use of accounting information in federal economic policy formation. *W. W. Cooper.* Accounting Rev. July, 1948.

———. The commercial and anti-trust aspects of term requirements contracts. *William E. Stockhausen.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. July, 1948.

———. The menace of monopoly. *Ellis Arnall.* Southwest Rev. Summer, 1948.

Church and State. Religion and the public schools. *B. H. Bode.* School and Society. Mar. 27, 1948.

———. The church, the state, and Mrs. McCollum. *Clarence E. Manion.* Notre Dame Lawyer. May, 1948.

———. No lamb of God in school. *William J. Butler.* Catholic World. June, 1948.

Civil Rights. The New York state law against discrimination. *Henry Spitz.* N. Y. State Bar Assn. Bull., Feb., 1948.

———. Constitutionality of federal anti-lynching legislation. *Robert S. Olivier.* Notre Dame Lawyer. May, 1948.

———. White supremacy—crisis or plot? *Thomas Sancton.* Nation. July 24, 31, 1948.

Civil Service. Salaries of federal employees by major pay groups. *Lucile C. Ursell and John W. Mitchell.* Mo. Labor Rev., July, 1948.

———. Civil service: wartime appointment. *Richards C. Osborn.* Soc. Sci., July, 1948.

———. An appraisal of in-service training. *Arthur W. Bromage.* Pub. Management. July, 1948.

———. Women in government. *Bernice T. Van der Vries.* State Govt. June, 1948.

———. Paying state employees. *James M. Mitchell.* State Govt. May, 1948.

———. Do veterans want preference? *Ira H. Cisin and Jack Elinson.* Personnel Admin. May, 1948.

———. A democratic approach to creating personnel policy. *C. O. Henderson.* Personnel Admin. May, 1948.

———. What price ability in the public service? *Gordon R. Clapp.* Personnel Admin. May, 1948.

———. Separating one million employees. *Matthew R. Gray* and *Walter F. Meyer.* Personnel Admin. May, 1948.

———. How good is your classification plan? *Hiram S. Phillips.* Pub. Personnel Rev. July, 1948.

———. Personnel administration in the veterans administration. *George H. Sweet.* Pub. Personnel Rev. July, 1948.

———. The Minnesota cost-of-living pay plan. *Robert D. Stover.* Pub. Personnel Rev. July, 1948.

———. Cost accounting in a personnel agency. *Joseph W. Hawthorne* and *Muriel M. Morse.* Pub. Personnel Rev. July, 1948.

———. A reappraisal of federal employment as a career. *Paul H. Appleby.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

Constitutional Law. Insurance as commerce—after four years. *Pat McCarran.* Notre Dame Lawyer, Mar., 1948.

———. Vested rights and the portal-to-portal act. *Ray A. Brown.* Mich. Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. The migratory divorce and full faith and credit clause. *Dougal Herr.* Temple Law Quar. Apr., 1948.

———. The portal-to-portal act of 1947; direct and indirect impairment of vested rights. *James D. Barnett.* Ore. Law Rev., June, 1948.

———. Constitutional law in 1946–1947. *Robert E. Cushman.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The heart of the constitution. *V. A. Collins.* Ala. Lawyer. July, 1948.

———. The Alabama use tax and interstate commerce. *Robert E. Steiner, III.* Ala. Lawyer. July, 1948.

Criminal Procedure. Two years of the federal rules of criminal procedure. *Lester B. Orfield.* Temple Law Quar. Apr., 1948.

———. Criminal procedure from arrest to appeal; a book review. *Charles S. Potts.* Tex. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Collateral attack by habeas corpus upon federal judgments in criminal cases. *Frank A. Peters.* Wash. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. The grand jury—use it or lose it. *A. Vere Shaw.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Society. June, 1948.

———. The interstate compact for the supervision of parolees and probationers. *Edwina Mitchell.* Ala. Lawyer. July, 1948.

Defense. All-out war on the production front? *A. H. Raskin.* Commentary. June, 1948.

———. Mobilizing the nation's power for national defense. *Purcell L. Smith.* Pub. Util. Fort. June 3, 1948.

———. No safety in numbers. *R. C. Richardson.* Atlantic. June, 1948.

———. Navy brass imperils our defense. *William Bradford Huie.* Am. Mercury. July, 1948.

———. The question of controls. *R. S. Meriam.* Harvard Bus. Rev. July, 1948.

———. If war comes again. *Jerry Kluttz.* Nation's Business. July, 1948.

———. The price of war. *Hanson W. Baldwin.* Harper's. July, 1948.

———. Defense agencies concerned about power supply. *T. N. Sandifer.* Pub. Util. Fort. July 15, 1948.

———. Relationship of the power industry to national defense. *J. W. Swaren.* Pub. Util. Fort. July 29, 1948.

———. The Maginot line of America. *Robert Wood Johnson.* Harper's. Aug., 1948.

———. The shifting strategy of American defense and diplomacy. *Samuel Flagg Bemis.* Va. Quar. Rev. Summer, 1948.

———. Our military needs. *Walter Millis.* Yale Rev., Summer, 1948.

Education. Regional educational planning in the south. *Millard F. Caldwell.* State Govt. May, 1948.

———. Regional education—southern leadership for the nation. *Burgin E. Dossett.* Tenn. Planner. June, 1948.

Finance. The community property trend. *William Q. DeFuniak.* Notre Dame Lawyer. Mar., 1948.

———. The problem of income tax in community property states. *B. Frank Watson.* Neb. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Constitutional uniformity as a rule for the validity of license taxes in Kentucky. *William L. Matthews, Jr.* Ky. Law Jour. May, 1948.

———. Some taxpayers got relief—more didn't. *Hyman Bookbinder.* Labor and Nation. May–June, 1948.

———. The rôle of economics in federal tax administration. *Wirth F. Ferger.* Nat. Tax Jour. June, 1948.

———. The great debt redemption, 1946–1947. *Hedwig Reinhardt.* Soc. Research. June, 1948.

———. Treasury tax studies, I. *Catherine Ruggles Gerrish.* Nat. Tax Jour. June, 1948.

———. The revenue act of 1948. *Edward N. Polisher.* Dickinson Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. Trends in the ad valorem taxation of intangibles. *Edward Roesken.* Taxes. July, 1948.

———. The revenue act of 1948. *John C. Curry.* Ala. Lawyer. July, 1948.

———. Idealism and war bonds: comparative study of the two world wars. *Gordon F. Streib.* Pub. Opinion Quar. Summer, 1948.

———. The great economy act. *Simon O. Lesser.* Am. Scholar. Summer, 1948.

———. Federal taxes and the family: the revenue act of 1948. *John W. Ervin.* So. Calif. Law Rev. July, 1948.

———. Land speculation and the taxing power. *J. R. Mason.* Am. Jour. of Econ. and Sociol. July, 1948.

———. Trends in governmental accounting. *Lloyd Morey.* Accounting Rev. July, 1948.

Foreign Policy. Statistics and foreign policy. *Willard L. Thorp.* Jour. of the Am. Statistical Assn. Mar., 1948.

———. The foreign loan policy of the U. S. *J. B. Condliffe.* Econ. Internazionale. Maggio, 1948.

———. The management of our operations abroad. *Edwin B. George.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. Training responsibilities in the department of state. *Frank Snowden Hopkins.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. Our present China policy. *Theodore H. Cohen.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. America and the east-west crisis. *A. Th. Polyzoides.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. Was there an ultimatum before Pearl Harbor? *Norman Hill.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Apr., 1948.

———. International legislation and the American system. *William L. Ransom.* Tulane Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. Our new German policy and the DP's. *Samuel Gringauz.* Commentary. June, 1948.

———. The Indo-China dilemma: an American responsibility. *Robert Laurel.* Am. Perspective. June, 1948.

———. American flipflop in Indonesia. *Andrew Roth.* Nation. July 10, 1948.

———. The 1947 foreign relief program. Dept. of State Bull. July 25, 1948.

———. The mechanism of American foreign policy. *William L. Langer.* Int. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. Secretary of State Marshall. *Donald Robinson.* Am. Mercury. July, 1948.

———. Pricing exports under the foreign assistance act of 1948. *Harry Howell.* Accounting Rev. July, 1948.

———. Pearl Harbor in retrospect. *Sherman Miles.* Atlantic. July, 1948.

———. Our mistakes in Germany. *S. Miles Bouton.* Am. Mercury. Aug., 1948.

———. What is our stake in China? *Nathaniel Peffer.* Va. Quar. Rev. Summer, 1948.

Gambling. Federal regulation and state gambling laws. *Walter H. Moses.* Vanderbilt Law Rev. June, 1948.

Governors. Governors' messages, 1948. State Govt. Mar., 1948.

———. Should the governor have a 4-year term: yes, *Robert S. Tubbs,* no, *Robert H. Clark.* Mich. State Bar Jour. May, 1948.

———. Should the governor appoint the secretary of state and attorney-gen-

eral? yes, *Marie H. Kamberg*, no, *Emmanuel B. Reese*. Mich. State Bar Jour. May, 1948.

Hawaii. A new constitution for Hawaii. *Norman Meller*. State Govt. June, 1948.

Housing. Can incentive taxation solve the housing shortage? *Edwin H. Spengler*. Am. City. June, 1948.

———. The controversy over a long-range federal housing program. Cong. Digest. June–July, 1948.

———. The record of public housing. *Anya F. Smith*. Am. Mercury. July 1948.

Immigration. Shall we open our gates again? *C. Lester Walker*. Nation's Business. June, 1948.

Indians. Wampum woes of the Navajos. *Oliver La Farge*. Nation's Business. July, 1948.

Judiciary. Amicus curiae—minister of justice. *Edmund Ruffin Beckwith* and *Rudolf Sobernheim*. Fordham Law Rev. Mar., 1948.

———. The judicial office in the U. S. *John J. Parker*. N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. The Missouri non-partisan court plan—selection and tenure of judges. *Henry A. Bundschu*. Univ. of Kansas City Law Rev., Apr.–June, 1948.

———. Measurement of judicial personnel. *Rodney L. Mott*. N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Historical bases of the federal judicial system. *John P. Frank*. Ind. Law Jour. Apr., 1948.

———. The lost horizon in pleading under the federal rules of civil procedure. *James Alger Fee*. Col. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Mr. Justice Rutledge. *David M. Levitan*. Va. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. The selection and tenure of judges. *Ernest A. Inglis*. Conn. Bar Jour. June, 1948.

———. A free judiciary: American system contrasted with Soviet. *Alexander Wiley*. Am. Bar Assn. Jour. June, 1948.

———. Chief Justice Marshall and the mercantile tradition. *Wallace Mendelson*. Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. June, 1948.

———. The federal judiciary. *John J. Parker*. Tulane Law Rev. June, 1948.

Labor. An empirical theory of the labor movement: W. Stanley Jevons. *Milton R. Konvitz*. Philosophical Rev. Jan., 1948.

———. Where are we going with picketing? *Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong*. Calif. Law Rev. Mar., 1948.

———. Unsolved problems of labor law. *Theodore R. Iserman*. Temple Law Quar. Apr., 1948.

———. The constitutional power of the chief officer in American labor unions. *Philip Taft*. Quar Jour. of Econ. May, 1948.

———. Labor legislation: the last two years. State Govt. June, 1948.

———. Labor unions can't do business with government. *Alfred M. Cooper*. Pub. Util. Fort. July 15, 1948.

———. Power is labor's dilemma. *Leopold Schwarzschild*. Nation's Business. Aug., 1948.

Legislatures. Some aspects of the legislative process in the U. S. *Paul Dolan*. Dickinson Law Rev. Mar., 1948.

———. Legislative research and planning in Kentucky. *Gladys M. Kammerer*. Ky. Law Jour. May, 1948.

———. Representation in the general assembly; some aspects of the present system. *John Hicks Riege*. Conn. Bar Jour. June, 1948.

———. Something about Congress. *Vernon X. Miller.* Loyola Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. Coördination of federal budgetary and appropriations procedures under the legislative reorganization act of 1946. *Avery Leiserson.* Nat. Tax Jour. June, 1948.

———. Constitution and legislature in Texas. *George O. Nokes, Jr.* State Govt. July, 1948.

Loyalty. Some aspects of loyalty. *Charles E. Merriam.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. The federal loyalty program: background and problems. *Roger S. Abbott.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Loyalty and the civil servant. *Edward H. Sherman.* Rocky Mt. Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. Loyalty review of federal employees. *H. Eliot Kaplan.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. July, 1948.

Military Justice. Reform in military justice. *Philip T. McCook.* N. Y. State Bar Assn. Bull. Apr., 1948.

———. Carter: an American Dreyfus? *Casper W. Ooms.* Ill. Law Rev. Mar–Apr., 1948.

Parties and Elections. Straws and bricks in the political winds. *Hazel G. Erskine.* Labor and Nation. May–June, 1948.

———. Where pandemonium and politics meet. *Junius B. Wood.* Nation's Business. June, 1948.

———. CIO and political discipline. *Jack Altman.* Labor and Nation. May–June, 1948.

———. The rise of negro voting in Texas. *Donald S. Strong.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The white primary: 1944–1948. *O. Douglas Weeks.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The sectional issue in the 1918 congressional elections. *Seward W. Livermore.* Miss. Valley Hist. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Rout of the bourbons. *Robert Bendiger.* Nation. July 24, 1948.

———. Harold E. Stassen. *Louis Jay Herman.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

———. The Wallace party. *Howard K. Smith.* Nation. Aug. 7, 1948.

———. Henry Wallace: a divided mind. *Gardner Jackson.* Atlantic. Aug., 1948.

———. A new primary system. *Joseph P. Harris.* State Govt. July, 1948.

———. Ghosts that haunt the hustings. *Herbert Corey.* Nation's Business. Aug., 1948.

———. The dilemma of the democrats. *William G. Carleton.* Va. Quar. Rev. Summer, 1948.

Presidency. Proposed changes in the presidential election system. *Estes Kefauver.* Vanderbilt Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. The tenure of cabinet officers. *Everett S. Brown.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. American presidential prospects. *S. K. Ratcliffe.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. State law on the nomination, election, and instruction of presidential electors. *Ruth C. Silva.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Lincoln and the territorial patronage; the ascendancy of the radicals in the west. *Vincent G. Tegeder.* Miss. Valley Hist. Rev. June, 1948.

———. President Harry. *Richard H. Rovere.* Harper's. July, 1948.

———. Shall the people elect the president? *William S. Jenkins* and *Charles S. James, Jr.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

———. The American president. *Clinton L. Rossiter.* Yale Rev. Summer, 1948.

———. The military hero as presidential candidate. *Albert Somit.* Pub. Opinion Quar. Summer, 1948.

Public Health. Kansas state board of health. *Dwight Howard.* Kan. Govt. Jour. May, 1948.

Public Lands. Who gets our public lands? *Arthur H. Carhart.* Atlantic. July, 1948.

———. Sacred cows and public lands. *Bernard DeVoto.* Harper's. July, 1948.

Public Welfare. The west looks to regional care. *Grant Macfarlane.* State Govt. May, 1948.

———. Public assistance categories: yes or no? *Alton A. Linford.* Soc. Service Rev. June, 1948.

———. The California youth authority. *Dorothy Freeman.* Soc. Service Rev. June, 1948.

———. Combatting mental illness. *Francis W. Russell.* State Govt. July, 1948.

Public Works. An approach to modern highway planning. *Spencer Miller, Jr.* State Govt. June, 1948.

———. Inventory of public construction needs. *E. J. Howenstine, Jr.* Am. Econ. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Single purpose flood control pays off in Ohio. *John P. Callahan.* Pts. I, II. Pub. Util. Fort. July 15, 29, 1948.

Radio. Motion pictures, radio, and comics. *Arthur J. Freund.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Society. Apr., 1948.

———. Recent trends in censorship of radio-broadcast programs. *Paul M. Segal.* Rocky Mt. Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. The rôle of radio in emergencies. *James H. Collins.* Pub. Util. Fort. June 17, 1948.

Reconstruction. Thaddeus Stevens: radical republican. *Carol L. Thompson.* Current Hist. May, 1948.

———. Andrew Johnson and the lost cause. *Carol L. Thompson.* Current Hist. June, 1948.

Recreation. State government's rôle in recreation. *Garrett G. Eppley.* State Govt. May, 1948.

Social Security. Coverage of the self-employed under the old-age and survivors insurance program. *Harold P. Packer* and *George J. Leibowitz.* Calif. Law Rev. Mar., 1948.

———. The employment security program. *E. J. Eberling.* Vanderbilt Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

TVA. TVA: a democratic method for the development of region's resources. *Gordon R. Clapp.* Vanderbilt Law Rev. Feb., 1948.

Tidelands. United States v. California (the Tidelands case). *Elton M. Hyder, Jr.* Miss. Law Jour. May, 1948.

———. Problems in Florida and other coastal states caused by the California tidelands decision. *Julius F. Parker.* Univ. of Fla. Law Rev. Spring, 1948.

Taft-Hartley Act. The labor management relations act. *Paul M. Herzog.* N. Y. State Bar Assn. Bull. Feb., 1948.

———. Administrative law and the Taft-Hartley act. *Gerhard P. Van Arkel.* Ore. Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Collective bargaining and the Taft-Hartley act. *Walter L. Daykin.* Iowa Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. The Taft-Hartley act in action. *Thomas Robert Mulroy.* Univ. of Chicago Law Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. Labor under the Taft-Hartley act. *Julie Meyer.* Soc. Research. June, 1948.

———. The "new" national labor relations act in operation: first eight months. *William B. Lockhart.* Minn. Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. The adverse effect on the principle of voluntary arbitration of the Taft-Hartley act and of the anti-labor laws recently passed in some thirty states. *J. Albert Wall.* Arbitration Jour. Spring, 1948.

———. The closed shop and the Taft act. *Jerome L. Toner.* Jour. of Pol. Econ. June, 1948.

———. Collective bargaining under the Taft-Hartley act. *Beryl Harold Levy.* Harvard Bus Rev. July, 1948.

———. The periodical press and the Taft-Hartley act. *Philip Ash.* Public Opinion Quar. Summer, 1948.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Books and Pamphlets

Barnoun, A. J. The making of modern Holland. Pp. 224. London: Allen and Unwin. 1948.

Batten, T. R. Problems of African development. Pt. 2, government and people. Pp. 180. London: Oxford Univ. Press. 1948.

Brown, Hilton. The sahibs: the life and ways of the British in India as recorded by themselves. Pp. 266. London: Hodge. 1948.

Catlin, George. In the path of Mahatma Gandhi. Pp. 320. London: Macdonald. 1948.

Churchill, Winston L. S. The gathering storm. Pp. 800. Boston: Houghton. 1948.

Cross, Samuel H. Slavic civilization through the ages. Pp. 205. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press. 1948.

Dobb, Maurice. Soviet economic development since 1917. Pp. 474. London: Routledge and K. Paul. 1948.

Fitzgibbon, Russell H., et al. The constitutions of the Americas. Pp. 867. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1948.

Gaevernitz, Gero. U. S. revolt against Hitler. The personal account of Fabian von Schlabendorff. Pp. 176. London: Eyre and Spottiswood. 1948.

Gangulee, N. Indians in the empire overseas. Pp. 263. London: New India Pub. Co. 1948.

Girtin, T. Haward. The lord mayor of London. Pp. 72. London: Oxford Univ. Press. 1948.

Gouzenko, Igor. The iron curtain, Pp. 286. N. Y.: Dutton. 1948.

Jefferys, James B. ed. Labour's formative years. Nineteenth century. Vol. II, 1848–80. Pp. 203. London: Lawrence and Wishart. 1948.

Jewkes, John. Ordeal by planning. Pp. 259. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Labour party yearbook, 1947–48. Pp. 367. London: Transport House. 1948.

Lebedev, Vladimir Ivanovich. Stanlinskaĭa Konstitutŝiia. Pp. 79. Moscow: 1947.

Lindsay, M. Shall we reform the lords? Pp. 72. London: Falcon Press. 1948.

Lovell, Maurice. The Soviet way of Life. Pp. 219. London: Methuen. 1948.

Majumdar, Ramesh Chandra, et al. An advanced history of India. Pp. 1092. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Marvel, Tom. The new Congo. Pp. 408. N. Y.: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 1948.

Newton, A. P. A hundred years of the British empire. Pp. 416. London: Duckworth. 1948.

Nemov, Nikolai Vasilevich. Vybory v mestnye sovety. Pp. 46. 1947.

Nicholson, Marjorie. Self-government and the communal problem. Pp. 45. London: Gollancz. 1948.

Ord, Lewis C. Politics and poverty. Pp. 188. London: Mayflower Pub. Co. 1948.

Qureshi, Anwal Iqbal. The future of the co-operative movement in India. Pp. 166. London: Oxford. 1947.

Rawlinson, H. G. The British achievement in India; a survey. Pp. 250. London: Wm. Hodge. 1948.

Rey, Charles Fernand. The Union of South Africa and some of its problems. Pp. 60. N. Y.: 1947.

Robson, William A. Public administration today. Pp. 26. London: Stevens. 1948.

Rossiter, Clinton L. Constitutional dictatorship: crisis government in modern democracies. Pp. 331. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton. Univ. Press. 1948.

Smellie, Kingsley Bryce. A history of local government. Pp. 192. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Vandenbosch, Amry, and Eldersveld, Samuel J. Government of the Netherlands. Pp. 150. Lexington, Ky.: Univ. of Kentucky, 1947.

Walsh, Edmund A. Total powers: a footnote to history. Pp. 381. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday. 1948.

Whitson, A. M., and Horsfall, L. F. Britain and the West Indies. Pp. 90, London: Longmans. 1948.

Ziegler, Oswald L. ed. This is Australia. Pp. 400. London: Harrap. 1948.

Articles

Australia. The Australian housing programme. *Ronald Mendelsohn.* Pub. Admin. Summer, 1948.

Austria. Austria: key for war and peace. *Karl Renner.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

Burma. Constitutions in the making. *Marguerite Wardlow.* Common Cause. May, 1948.

Canada. Administrative law: 1923–1947. *F. R. Scott.* Can. Bar Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. The constitution in a changing world. *Vincent C. MacDonald.* Can. Bar Rev., Jan., 1948.

———. Free competition and the public interest. *S. F. Sommerfeld.* Univ. of Toronto Law Jour., Lent Term, 1948.

———. Discretionary powers of public authorities; their control by the courts. *C. B. Bourne.* Univ. of Toronto Law Jour., Lent Term, 1948.

———. Parliamentary broadcasting and the law of defamation. *A. G. Davis.* Univ. of Toronto Law Jour., Lent Term, 1948.

———. The effect of statutes upon the rights and liabilities of the crown. *H. Street.* Univ. of Toronto Law Jour., Lent Term, 1948.

———. Quasi-judicial powers under the unemployment insurance act. *H. S. Relph.* Can. Bar Rev., Mar., 1948.

———. Delegation of legislative power to the lieutenant-governors in council. *G. S. Rutherford.* Can. Bar Rev., Mar., 1948.

———. Royal commissions and Canadian agricultural policy. *V. C. Fowke.* Can. Jour. of Econ. and Pol. Sci. May, 1948.

———. Political participation and the organization of the coöperative commonwealth federation in Saskatchewan. *S. M. Lipset.* Can. Jour. of Econ. and Pol. Sci. May, 1948.

———. Canada: abdication of Mr. King. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. The Ontario elections. *G. M. A. Grube.* Can. Forum. July, 1948.

———. Investment in health. I. *John S. Morgan.* Can. Forum. July, 1948.

———. The political situation in Canada. *J. A. Stevenson.* Pol. Quar. July–Oct., 1948.

China. Land redistribution in communist China. *Frank C. Lee.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1948.

———. China and America. *C. Yun.* China. May, 1948.

———. Formosa in transition. *R. H. F.* World Today. May, 1948.

———. Law and courts in China. *S. Francis Liu.* China. June, 1948.

———. The outlook in China: tragedy of a divided country. *H.G.W.W.* World Today. June, 1948.

———. Chinese-American relations. *V. K. Wellington Koo.* China. June, 1948.

———. The American AAG in China. *David G. Barr.* China. July, 1948.

———. Aid to China: a Shanghai view. *Randall Gould.* Far Eastern Survey. July 7, 1948.

———. China's losing game in Mongolia. *James Burke.* Far Eastern Survey. July 7, 1948.

———. Some problems of Chinese youth in transition. *Ai-Li S. Chin.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. July, 1948.

———. Development of a Chinese constitutional law. *Roscoe Pound.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. July, 1948.

Czechoslovakia. Politics and education in Czechoslovakia. *Thomas Woody.* School and Society. June 19, 1948.

———. The Czechoslovak revolution. *Robert Bruce Lockhart.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. The tragedy of Dr. Beneš. *R. Arnold Jones.* Soundings. July, 1948.

———. Memoirs of Eduard Beneš. Nation. July 10, 17, 24, 1948.

Eire. The foreign trade of the Irish free state. *G. A. Duncan.* Econ. Internazionale. Maggio, 1948.

———. Ireland: the new government. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. Jim Larkin; Irish labor champion. *Thomas F. Doyle.* Catholic World. June, 1948.

———. The partition of Ireland. *Herbert L. Matthews.* Harper's. Aug., 1948.

France. L'heure de la resistance. *G. Rigassi.* Rev. de Droit Int. Jan.–Mar., 1948.

———. La pratique de la question de confiance sous la IV^e^ République. *Claude-Albert Colliard.* Rev. du Droit Pub. et de la Sci. Pol. Avril–Juin, 1948.

———. Edouard Drumont and La France Juive. *R. F. Brynes.* Jewish Soc. Studies. Apr., 1948.

———. France et allemagne. *Henry Lepeytre.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. L'organisation de la defense nationale. *Andri Monteil.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. Le sens et la portée des elections à l'Assemblée Algérienne. *P. E. Viard.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. Le régime parlementaire sous la IV^e^ République. (II). *B. Mirkine-Guetzévitch.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. The new pessimism in France. *E. O. Siepmann.* Nine. Cent. and After. May, 1948.

———. French labour. *Melton S. Davis.* Fortnightly. May, 1948.

———. France's problems and prospects. *Jean Castet.* Contemp. Rev. May, 1948.

———. Le gouvernement du Gén. de Gaulle,IV, V. *Émile Giraud.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, Juin, 1948.

———. New signs in France's political skies. *Raymond Jouve.* America. June 5, 1948.

———. Tunisia—a convalescent protectorate. *S.E.C.* World Today. June, 1948.

———. Political forces in present-day France. *Henry W. Ehrmann.* Soc. Research. June, 1948.

———. French monetary and fiscal policies. *D. A. Snider.* Am. Econ. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The problem of political reform in France. *Humbert Michaud.* Nine. Cent. and After. June, 1948.

———. Nationalism in French North Africa. *Nina Epton.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The Langevin plan for the reform of education in France. *Adolph E. Meyer.* School and Society. July 10, 1948.

———. Schuman's overthrow. *Bernard Gaston-cherau.* Nation. July 31, 1948.

———. German occupation and anti-semitism in France. *Elizabeth H. Zerner (with Robert T. Bower).* Pub. Opinion Quar. Summer, 1948.

Germany. Law and the legislative process in occupied Germany: I, II. *Karl Loewenstein.* Yale Law Jour. Mar., Apr., 1948.

———. Jews in the revolution of 1848 in Germany. *Adolf Kober.* Jewish Soc. Studies. Apr., 1948.

———. Sources of law in Germany. *C. P. Harvey.* Modern Law Rev., Apr., 1948.

———. Frankfurt, 1848 and 1948. *Felix E. Hirsch.* Current Hist. May, 1948.

———. Les droits de l'homme dans les constitutions des "pays" allemands. *P. M. Gaudemet.* Rev. du Droit Pub. et de la Sci. Pol. Avril–Juin, 1948.

———. German postwar constitutions (II). *William Fleming.* Current Hist. May, 1948.

———. The educational situation in Germany. *Chris A. de Young.* School and Society. May 1, 1948.

———. The French zone of Germany. *Stephen Simmons.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Postwar social services in Berlin. *David R. Hunter* and *Howard R. Studd.* Soc. Service Rev. June, 1948.

———. The German who should have been dead. *Cedric Belfrage.* Harper's. June, 1948.

———. The Bohemian background of German national socialism: the D.A.P., D.S.N.A.P., and N.S.D.A.P. *Erik R. von Kuehnelb-Leddihn.* Jour. of Hist. of Ideas. June, 1948.

———. New constitutions in Germany. *Robert G. Neumann.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Postwar German finances. *S. P. Chambers.* Int. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. Cohesion and disintegration in the wehrmacht in world war II. *Edward A. Shils* and *Morris Janowitz.* Pub. Opinion Quar. Summer, 1948.

———. Reaction of educated Germans to defeat. *Clifford Kirkpatrick.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. July, 1948.

———. Back to Berlin. *Ernest Borneman.* Harper's. Aug., 1948.

———. Land reform in Germany, U. S. zone. *P. Ucker.* Am. Jour. of Econ. and Sociol. July, 1948.

Great Britain. La reconstrucción económica de Gran Bretaña. *Fernando Eseribano.* Moneda y Crédito. Dec., 1947.

———. The hour of decision. *G. W. Keeton.* World Affairs. Apr., 1948.

———. Crown proceedings act, 1947. *Harry Street.* Modern Law Rev., Apr., 1948.

———. The break-up of the poor law in Britain, 1907–47: an historical footnote. *John S. Morgan.* Can. Jour. of Econ. and Pol. Sci. May, 1948.

———. Parliament and press. *H. G. Nicholas.* Nine. Cent. and After. May, 1948.

———. Anglo-Egyptian relations. *Owen Tweedy.* Fortnightly. May, 1948.

———. A policy in the making. *George Glasgow.* Contemp. Rev. May, 1948.

———. Sir Stafford Cripps' first budget. *Francis W. Hirst.* Contemp. Rev. May, 1948.

———. The Indo-Irish parallel. *J. Sen.* Modern Rev. May, 1948.

———. Towards Liberal patriotism. *Frank Dupuis.* The purpose behind our policies. *Philip Fothergill.* Liberal. May, 1948.

———. The 1948 budget. *R. F. Harrod.* Soundings. May, 1948.

———. The British labor government and Franco Spain. *Elaine Windrich.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. British rule in west Africa. *Vernon McKay.* For. Policy Rep. June 15, 1948.

———. Britain's hard experience in socialism. *Wade H. Hayes.* Pub. Util. Fort. June 3, 1948.

———. The groundnuts scheme. *Kathleen Gibberd.* Fortnightly. June, 1948.

———. The juvenile employment service. *E. W. Woodhead.* Fortnightly. June, 1948.

———. Trade anomalies in the West Indies, I, II. *Percy G. Donald.* Crown Colonist. May, June, 1948.

———. The Gold Coast; a study in colonial development. *Florence M. Bourret.* Current Hist. June, 1948.

———. The Liberal Assembly, 1948, in review. Liberal. June, 1948.

———. The twilight of collectivism. *Douglas Woodruff.* Soundings. June, 1948.

———. Africa and the British political parties. *Henry Swanzy.* Soundings. June, 1948.

———. The new English national assistance scheme. *John Moss.* Soc. Service Rev. June, 1948.

———. The British subject. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. United Kingdom; suitors for the middle class. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. How democratic is Britain? *Margaret Cole.* Harper's. July, 1948.

———. Social change and social class in the Sierra Leone protectorate. *K. L. Little.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. July, 1948.

———. The United Kingdom export drive and the future. *A. H. S. Hinchliffe.* Int. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. An alternative policy. *R. F. Harrod.* The doctors' surrender. *Lord Horder.* Submerging the national tradition. *Douglas Woodruff.* Soundings. July, 1948.

———. The Anglo-Guatemalan dispute. *R. A. Humphreys.* Int. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. The outlook for Britain. *Thomas Balogh.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. Control of public expenditure in Great Britain. *Henry Bunbury.* Taxes. Aug., 1948.

———. Malta and self-government. *J. D. Krivine.* World Affairs. Summer, 1948.

———. Building a health service. *L. John Edwards.* Parliamentary control of government expenditure. *Osbert Peake.* Administrative problems of the board of trade. *John Henry Woods.* The participation of officials in administration. *A. J. T. Day.* Public Admin. Summer, 1948.

———. The British constitution in 1947. *K. C. Wheare.* Parl. Affairs. Summer, 1948.

———. The basis of procedure in the House of Commons, III. *Eric Taylor.* Parl. Affairs. Summer, 1948.

Greece. Operation Hellas: I. The Greek communist party. *F. A. Voigt.* II. Its setting in the world. *Ursula Branston.* Soundings. July, 1945.

Hungary. Hungary today. *Blanche Lucas.* World Affairs. Apr., 1948.

Iceland. Iceland: its importance in an air age. *J.W.* World Today. July, 1948.

India. Principles of a Gandhian constitution for India. *Khagendra Chandra Pal.* Mod. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. The basis of organization of our armed forces. *D. M. Sen.* Modern Rev. May, 1948.

———. Now or never. *Chowdry Akbar Khan.* Modern Rev. May, 1948.

———. Judiciary in Free India. *S. C. Mitter.* Modern Rev. May, 1948.

———. The executive, legislature, and judiciary of the Union of India. *R. N. Parikh.* Modern Rev. May, 1948.

———. Pakistan: the new state finds its feet. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. India: an enigmatic future. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. Crisis in Hyderabad. *William Barton.* Nat. Rev. July, 1948.

Indochina. Impasse in Indochina; the unity of Viet-Nam. *George Sheldon.* UN commission for Indochina? *John F. Embree.* Far Eastern Survey. June 2, 1948.

Italy. The Italian elections. *Ivor Thomas.* Contemp. Rev. May, 1948.

———. La nouvelle constitution italienne et le régionalisme (II). *A. E. Guillaume.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. The political mentality of the Italians. *Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn.* Catholic World. June, 1948.

———. Italy after the elections. *Antonio Giordano.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The new Italian constitution. *G.C.* World Today. July, 1948.

———. Favorable omens in Italy. *Vittorio Ivella.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

Japan. Reflections on Japan. *W. Macmahon Ball.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1948.

———. Japanese anti-trust legislation. *Lester N. Salwin.* Minn. Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Reconstruction in Japan. *O. M. Green.* Fortnightly. June, 1948.

———. Japan: reform vs. recovery. *Jerome B. Cohen.* Far Eastern Survey. June 23, 1948.

———. Land reform in Japan. *Andrew J. Grad.* Pacific Affairs. June, 1948.

———. Taxation reform in occupied Japan. *Henry Shavell.* Nat. Tax Jour. June, 1948.

———. Japanese reparations: fact or fantasy? *Martin Toscan Bennett.* Pacific Affairs. June, 1948.

———. Japanese politics: 1947–1948. *Kermit G. Stewart.* Far Eastern Survey. July 7, 1948.

———. Will emperor Hirohito abdicate? *Norman Soong.* China. July, 1948.

———. Reconstruction in Japan: a chequered outlook. *E.S. K.* World Today. July, 1948.

———. Trust-busting in Japan. *Eleanor M. Hadley.* Harv. Bus. Rev. July, 1948.

———. Defeat and democracy in Japan. *Yasaka Takagi.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

Korea. The Korean election. *Robert T. Oliver.* Land distribution in Korea. *Shannon McCune.* Far Eastern Survey. June 2, 1948.

———. Behind the Korean election. *Benjamin Weems.* Far Eastern Survey. June 23, 1948.

Latin America. An analysis of the Mexican liberal party, 1906. *Charles C. Cumberland.* The Americas. Jan., 1948.

———. A continent slides to ruin. *William Vogt.* Harper's. June, 1948.

———. Postwar Brazilian economic problems. *J. A. Kershaw.* Am. Econ. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Land utilization in Costa Rica. *Jorge León.* Geog. Rev. July, 1948.

Low Countries. Political and economic conditions in the low countries. *Eric C. Bellquist.* For. Policy Rep. May 1, 1948.

———. Le conseil d'état de Belgique. *L. Moreau et André Simmonard.* Rev. du Droit Pub. et de la Sci. Pol. Avril–Juin, 1948.

———. Belgium's prosperity: some problems of the future. *J.D.K.* World Today. June, 1948.

———. Holland takes the offensive. *Kenneth Adam.* Fortnightly. June, 1948.

Middle East. How not to develop a backward country. *Heshmat Ala'i.* Fortune, Aug., 1948.

———. The parliaments of Turkey and Persia. *M. Philips Price.* Parl. Affairs. Summer, 1948.

Mongolia. Mongol law—a concise historical survey. *V. A. Riasanovsky.* Mongol law—later developments. *Lawrence Krader.* The constitution of the Mongol People's Republic. Wash. Law Rev., May, 1948.

———. The constitution of the Mongol people's republic and soviet influences. *John N. Hazard.* Pacific Affairs. June, 1948.

New Zealand. New Zealand; the future and the past. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

Philippines. Financial and economic planning in the Philippines. *Shirley Jenkins.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1948.

Poland. Will Poland rise again? *Lawrence T. King.* Catholic World. June, 1948.

———. Geopolitics of Poland. *J. S. Roucek.* Am. Jour. of Econ. and Sociol. July, 1948.

Rumania. Rumania: the people's republic. *A. J. Fischer.* World Affairs. Apr., 1948.

Scandinavia. Political and economic conditions in the Scandinavian countries. *Eric C. Bellquist.* For. Policy Rep. May 15, 1948.

———. Scandinavia faces the future: neutrality or alliance? *A.G.S.* World Today. May, 1948.

———. The grand old man of Sweden. *Ernst Benedikt.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Scandinavia between the blocs. *Keith Hutchison.* Nation. July 17, 1948.

———. Scandinavia charts a course. *Erik Seidenfaden.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

Spain. Spain's purposeful path. *E. G. de Caux.* Nine. Cent. and After. May, 1948.

———. Spain: dead on its feet. *William Fifield.* Harper's. June, 1948.

———. In Spain today. *D.K.M.K.* World Today. July, 1948.

———. Spain's rôle in European recovery. *John Gilmour.* Catholic World. July, 1948.

U.S.S.R. Modern Soviet divorce practice. *G. M. Sverdlov.* Modern Law Rev., Apr., 1948.

———. The spirit of Soviet law. *Harold J. Berman.* Wash. Law Rev., May, 1948.

———. The political control of history texts in the Soviet Union. *Frederic Lilge.* School and Society. May 29, 1948.

———. Stalinism and the historic Russia. *Russian Correspondent.* Soundings. May, 1948.

———. The central Asian republics: their place in the Soviet system. *C.G.* World Today. May, 1948.

———. Colonising the soviet arctic. *Frank Illingworth.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Russia, plus and minus. I, II. *Alexander Werth.* Nation. July 31, Aug. 7, 1948.

———. The Russians and Berlin. *Alexander Werth.* Nation. July 10, 1948.

———. Inside the Russian zone, 1945–1947. *Peter Nettle.* Pol. Quar. July–Oct., 1948.

———. Memoirs of a soviet author. *Dmitri Buligin.* Am. Mercury. Aug., 1948.

———. The permanent mission; an essay on Russia. *Hans Kohn.* Rev. of Politics. July, 1948.

———. Notes on life and travel in Russia. *Frederick C. Barghoorn.* Yale Rev. Summer, 1948.

Union of South Africa. South Africa; the general election. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. Southwest Africa and the Union. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. Cross-roads in Africa. *W. Ward Jackson.* Soundings. July, 1948.

———. South Africa today. *Alexander Campbell.* Nat. Rev. July, 1948.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Books and Pamphlets

Almond, Gabriel Abraham. Western European politics and American policy. Pp. 43. New Haven: Yale Inst. of Int. Studies. 1948.

Bonne, Alfred. State and economics in the Middle East. Pp. 427. London: K. Paul. 1948.

Crowther, Geoffrey. The economic reconstruction of Europe. Pp. 88. Claremont, Calif.: Claremont Coll. 1948.

Friedrich, Carl J. Inevitable peace. Pp. 294. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press. 1948.

Gafencu, Grigoire. The last days of Europe; a diplomatic journey in 1939. Pp. 188. London: Muller. 1948.

Glubb, J. B. The story of the Arab legion. Pp. 371. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1948.

Hentz, Frederick. The economic problem of the Danubian states; a study in economic nationalism. Pp. 223. Forest Hills, N. Y.: Transatlantic arts. 1948.

Jacobi, F. J. ed. The Anglo-Palestine yearbook, 1947–48. Pp. 368. London: Anglo-Palestine Pubs. 1948.

Juenger, Ernst. The peace. Pp. 77. Hinsdale, Ill.: Henry Regnery Co. 1948.

Kulischer, Eugene Michel. Europe on the move; war and population changes. Pp. 388. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1948.

Layton, Lord. United Europe: the way to its achievement. Pp. 31. London: News Chronicle. 1948.

McNair, A. D. Legal effects of war. 3d ed. London: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1948.

Murray, Gilbert. From the league to the U.N. Pp. 217. London: Oxford Univ. Press. 1948.

Park, No-Yong. The white man's peace; an oriental view of our attempts at making world peace. Pp. 252. Boston: Meador. 1948.

Purcell, Victor W. W. The Chinese in Malaya. Pp. 343. N. Y.: Oxford. 1948.

Ragatz, Lowell Joseph. March of empire: the European overseas possessions on the eve of the first world war. Pp. 92. N. Y.: H. L. Lindquist. 1948.

Ross, Alf. A textbook of international law. Pp. 313. London: Longmans, Green. 1947.

Roucek, Joseph S. Balkan politics: international relations in no man's land. Pp. 311. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press. 1948.

Wheeler-Bennett, J. W. Munich: prologue to tragedy. Pp. 507. London: Macmillan. 1948.

Wolf, Charles, Jr. The Indonesian story: birth, growth, and structure of the Indonesian republic. Pp. 211. N. Y.: John Day. 1948.

Ziff, William B. The rape of Palestine. Pp. 599. London: St. Botolph's. 1948.

Articles

Arctic. Arctic diplomacy. *Blair Bolles.* For. Policy Rep. June 1, 1948.

Blocs. Ruthenia: football of international politics. *Joseph S. Roucek.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. Western lights. *William Rydal.* Fortnightly. May, 1948.

———. The western union; the big adventure. *George Glasgow.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Two worlds and none. *Frederick Mayer.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

Boundaries. The postwar world map: new states and boundary changes. *Russell H. Fifield.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

Communism. Communist strategy in Latin America. *J. H.* World Today. June, 1948.

———. The cominform and world communism. *Denis Healey.* Int. Affairs. July, 1948.

Danube. Freedom of navigation on the Danube. *Fred L. Hadsel.* Dept. of State Bull. June 20, 1948.

———. Russia balks Danube unionists. *Oscar Jaszi.* Freedom and Union. July–Aug., 1948.

Europe. Europe's hope for recovery. *J. J. McCloy.* Econ. Internazionale. Maggio, 1948.

———. The European crisis in France. *D. Thomson.* World Affairs. Apr., 1948.

———. Politics and police in postwar Europe. *"Custos Custodium."* Soundings. May, 1948.

———. The economic and political implications of a customs union. *C. Westrate.* Quar. Jour. of Econ. May, 1948.

———. The defence of Europe. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. The American guarantor. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. Vers l'Europe unie. *Edouard Bonnefas.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Juin, 1948.

———. Le congrès européen de la Haye. *Paul Bastid.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Juin, 1948.

———. Customs union vs. economic union in western Europe. *Laura Metzger.* Am. Perspective. June, 1948.

———. British commonwealth and western union. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. The voice of Europe. *Harold Butler.* Fortnightly. June, 1948.

———. The European coal organization. *Nathaniel Samuels.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. Quelques aspects psycho-sociologiques d'un ordre européen. *Pierre De Bie.* Politeia. Vol. I. Fasc. 1. 1948/49.

———. Is a U.S. of Europe practical? *Junius B. Wood.* Nation's Business. Aug., 1948.

ERP. Can the Marshall plan save Europe? *Leopold C. Klausner.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. Oltre il piana Marshall. *B. Griziotti.* Econ. Internazionale. Maggio, 1948.

———. Prélude aux finances européennes. *J. Compeyrot.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. Britain under Marshall aid. *R. F. Harrod.* Western Germany and Marshall aid. *"Bergo."* An economic council for Europe. *Michael Fogarty.* Soundings. June, 1948.

———. Political hazards of the ERP. *Tibor Payzs.* America. June 5, 1948.

———. Europe-America: un problema de integracion. *Richard Pattee. Politeia.* Vol. I. Fasc. 1. 1948/49.

———. Foreign policy in the making: the ERP. *Blair Bolles.* Am. Perspective. June, 1948.

———. East-west trade and the Marshall plan. *William Diebold, Jr.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. ERP. and British socialism. *Keith Hutchison.* Nation. July 31, 1948.

———. The impact of the European recovery program on inter-American trade. *Amos E. Taylor.* Bull. Pan Am. Union. July, 1948.

———. A new world takes shape. *Harold Butler.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. The task of economic recovery. *John H. Williams.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

International Finance. Gold in national and international economics. *K. P. Thakur.* Mod. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. The international bank for reconstruction and development—a new departure in international finance. *Robert L. Garner.* Vanderbilt Law Rev. June, 1948.

International Law. Les responsabilités des industriels dans la preparation de la guerre. *N. Veicopoulos.* Rev. de Droit Int. Jan.–Mar., 1948.

———. La définition et la répression des crimes contre l'humanité. *J. Graven.* Rev. de Droit Int. Jan.–Mar., 1948.

———. Rappel á ceux qui préparent la guerre. *Th. Iliades.* Rev. de Droit Int. Jan.–Mar., 1948.

———. La responsabilité pénale des collectivités. *J. A. Roux.* Rev. de Droit Int. Jan.–Mar., 1948.

———, International agreements. *J. E. Read.* Can. Bar Rev., Mar., 1948.

———. Trials of war criminals (non-Nuremberg). *Willard B. Cowles.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Apr., 1948.

———. Public opinion and the rules of civilized warfare. *Edward Clark Lukens.* Temple Law Quar. Apr., 1948.

———, International administrative law; a functional approach to peace. *Harrop A. Freeman.* Yale Law Jour. Apr., 1948.

———. The teaching of international law in law schools. *Kenneth S. Carlston.* Colgate Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. The quest for world law and order. *Wesley A. Sturges.* Tulane Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. The Corfu channel case; significance of first ruling by present court. *Manley O. Hudson.* Am. Bar Assn. Jour. June, 1948.

Inter-Parliamentary Union. The inter-parliamentary union. *Viscount Stansgate.* Contemp. Rev. June, 1948.

International Relations. The twilight of international morality. *Hans J. Morgenthau.* Ethics. Jan., 1948.

———. International relations and sociology. *W. Rex Crawford.* Am. Sociol. Rev. June, 1948.

———. Some views on semantics in international relations. *George A. Lundberg.* Am. Perspective. June, 1948.

———. An educated will to peace. *Norman Angell.* World Affairs. Summer, 1948.

———. Conflict of ideologies. *J. D. Mabbott.* Philosophy. July, 1948.

———. Economic penetration and power politics. *Charles C. Abbott.* Harvard Bus. Rev. July, 1948.

———. The concept of world-mindedness. *Emory S. Bogardus.* Sociol. and Soc. Research. July–Aug., 1948.

ITO. The ITO charter. *Richard Schüller.* Soc. Research. June, 1948.

League of Nations. Liquidation of League of Nations functions. *Denys P. Myers.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Apr., 1948.

———. The development of the league of nations idea in Great Britain, 1914–1919. *Henry R. Winkler.* Jour. of Mod. Hist. June, 1948.

Minorities. Minority population exchanges: Czechoslovakia and Hungary. *Istvan D. Kertesz.* Am. Perspective. June, 1948.

Narcotics. Narcotic drug control. *Herbert L. May.* Int. Concil. May, 1948.

Palestine. Palestine appeals to the privy council. *Norman Bentwich.* Juridical Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. The U.N. and the Palestine question. *A. S. Eban.* World Affairs. Apr., 1948.

———. Palestine note-book. *Bevil John Rudd.* Nine. Cent. and After. May, 1948.

———. Arabs, Zionists, and oil. *Sidney B. Fay.* Current Hist. May, 1948.

———. Iraq breaks with Britain. *Jon Kimche.* Nine. Cent. and After. June, 1948.

———. The great powers and Israel: what U.S. support means. *Hal Lehrman.* The rôle Britain hopes to play. *Richard H. S. Crossman.* Commentary. June, 1948.

———. After the mandate: the tragic error of the Balfour declaration. *Christopher Sykes.* Soundings. June, 1948.

———. Palestine et Islam arabe. *Georges Meyer.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Juin, 1948.

———. Palestine in Asia. *Eds.* Round Table. June, 1948.

———. Struggle in Palestine. *Martin Lipset.* Can. Forum. July, 1948.

———. Can Israel help the Arabs? *David L. Cohn.* Atlantic. Aug., 1948.

———. Behind the Palestine mess. *William B. Ziff.* Am. Mercury. Aug., 1948.

Red Cross. The principles of the red cross. *Max Huber.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

Regions. Okinawa: a problem in administration and reconstruction. *Daniel D. Karasik.* Far Eastern Quar. May, 1948.

———. Regional unity in southern Asia. *Virginia Thompson.* Pacific Affairs. June, 1948.

———. Problems confronting Christian missions in the far east. *Kenneth Scott Latourette.* Pacific Affairs. June, 1948.

———. International labor confederations: CIT and CTAL. *Jack Barbask.* Mo. Labor Rev. May, 1948.

———. La conference pan-americaine de Bogota. *Angel Marvaud.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Mai, 1948.

———. Latin America at Havana. *Harry B. Murkland.* Current Hist. June, 1948.

———. Bogota, 1948. *William C. Atkinson.* Fortnightly. June, 1948.

———. Bogota conference. *William Sanders.* Int. Concil. June, 1948.

———. Inter-American labor and democracy. *Bernado Ibanez.* Am.Federationist. June, 1948.

———. The Spanish for Monroe doctrine. *Eds.* Round Table, June, 1948.

———. The Bogotá conference. *Alberto Lleras.* Bull. Pan Am. Union. June, 1948.

———. The ninth Pan American child congress. *Katherine F. Lenroot.* Bull. Pan Am. Union. June, 1948.

———. The new world looks at its Indians. *Robert C. Jones.* Bull. Pan Am. Union. June, 1948.

———. The charter of the organization of American states. *William Manger.* Bull. Pan. Am. Union. July, 1948.

———. Canada and the inter-American system. *Vincent Massey.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. The institute of inter-American affairs. I, II, III, IV. *Louis J. Halle, Jr.* Dept. of State Bull. May 23, June 13, June 27, July 11, 1948.

Timor. Colonial rivalries in Timor. *William Burton Sowash.* Far Eastern Quar. May, 1948.

Trieste. Trieste as an international centre. *Anne Dacie.* Fortnightly. May, 1948.

Trustees. The states directly concerned: article 79 of the U.N. Charter. *George V. Wolfe.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Apr., 1948.

———. Legal problems arising from the U.N. trusteeship system. *Frances B. Sayre.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Apr., 1948.

———. Political development in western Samoa. *J. W. Davidson.* Pacific Affairs. June, 1948.

———. Trusteeship in action: the U.N. mission to Western Samoa. *Lawrence S. Finkelstein.* Int. Organization. June, 1948.

———. The squalid farce of trusteeship. *Julius Lewin.* Nation. July 31, 1948.

U.N. International disputes and the limitations of the U.N. *Kurt Wilk.* Arbitration Jour. Spring, 1948.

———. The special Balkan committee of the general assembly of the united nations. *Warren R. Austin.* Notre Dame Lawyer. Mar., 1948.

———. The share of Canada in the making of the U.N. *Clyde Eagleton.* Univ. of Toronto Law Jour. Lent Term, 1948.

———. The U.N. in action today. *Linden A. Mander.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. U.N. progress report: the first three months of 1948. *Royal Purcell.* World Affairs Interp. Spring, 1948.

———. The world court and the U.N. *F. Blaine Sloan.* Iowa Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. The specialized agencies and the U.N.: progress report, II. *Walter R. Sharp.* Int. Organ. June, 1948.

———. Voting in the security council. *Bernhard G. Bechhoefer.* Dept. of State Bull. July 4, 1948.

UNESCO. Fresco, UNESCO, and Mr. Wierblowski. *George D. Stoddard.* School and Society. Mar. 6, 1948.

———. The human sciences and world peace—a report on the UNESCO project: tensions affecting international understanding. *Hadley Cantril.* Pub. Opinion Quar. Summer, 1948.

Veto. The use of the veto. *Norman J. Padelford.* Int. Organ. June, 1948.

———. The veto versus the sense of the meeting. *Richmond P. Miller.* World Affairs. Summer, 1948.

World Government. Right road to European federation. *A. R. Brent.* Common Cause. May, 1948.

———. The question of a minimum constitution. *Erich Kahler.* Common Cause. June, 1948.

———. World government and social justice. *George Catlin.* Common Cause. June, 1948.

———. Dead end: federalism limited. *Harris Wofford.* Common Cause. May, 1948. Strait is the gate. *Ibid.* June, 1948.

———. War and peace in western thought. *Mortimer J. Adler.* Common Cause. June, 1948.

———. Foundations of the world republic. I. II. *G. A. Borgese.* Common Cause. June, July, 1948.

———. Looking toward one world. *Symposium.* Annals of Am. Acad. July, 1948.

———. A speech in Frankfurt. *Robert M. Hutchins.* Common Cause, July, 1948.

———. The functional approach to world organization. *David Mitrany.* Int. Affairs. July, 1948.

———. Why minimal world government? *Emile Benoit-Smullyan.* Common Cause. July, 1948.

———. Looking toward one world. *Symposium.* Annals Am. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Sci. July, 1948.

WHO. The world health organization. *Brock Chisholm.* Its program and accomplishments. *C.-E. A. Winslow.* Int. Concil. Mar., 1948.

World War II. Peace settlements of world war II. *Symposium.* Annals Am. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Sci. May, 1948.

———. Problems of a Japanese peace settlement. *Doland P. Ray.* World Affairs. Summer, 1948.

———. The parallel problems of Italy and Japan. *Frederick Mignone.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

———. Germany, the Soviet Union, and Turkey during world war II. *Harry N. Howard.* Dept. of State Bull. July 18, 1948.

World War III. The labor aspect of world war III preparedness. *Stanley Paul.* Labor and Nation. May–June, 1948.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Books and Pamphlets

Bollens, John C. The problem of government in the San Francisco Bay region. Pp. 162. Berkeley: Bureau of Pub. Admin. Univ. of California. 1948.

Collins, Arthur. Municipal internal audits. 8th ed. Pp. 364. London: Gee. 1948.

Forbes, James, ed. Municipal yearbook, 1948. Pp. 1456. London: Municipal Journal. 1948.

Hasluck, H. S. Local government in England. 2d ed. Pp. 364. London: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1948.

Mauck, Elwyn A. Improving the government of Takoma Park. Pp. 45. College Park, Md.: Univ. of Maryland. 1948.

National Inst. of Municipal Law Officers. Parking meters—legality—model ordinance, annotated by Charles S. Rhyne and Charlie O. Murphy. Pp. 29. Washington: Author. 1947.

Ridley, Clarence Eugene, and Simon, Herbert A. Specifications for the annual municipal report. Pp. 52. Chicago: Int. City Managers Assn. 1948.

Articles

Butte. What happened in Butte. *Joseph Kinsey Howard.* Harper's. Aug., 1948.

Cities. Cities need more advisory services. *Luther Gulick.* Pub. Management. June, 1948.

———. What's wrong with our cities? *Hubert H. Humphrey.* Am. City. July, 1948. Minn. Municipalities. July, 1948.

———. A forward look in municipal accounting. *Lloyd Morey.* Mun. Finance. Feb., 1948.

———. Principles of municipal utility accounting. *Irving Tenner.* Mun. Finance. Feb., 1948.

Finance. Remedies for disproportionate tax assessments in Kentucky. *George Muehlenkamp.* Kentucky Law Jour. May, 1948.

———. Some problems in special assessment district obligations; a study of Michigan drain bond cases. *Irvin Long.* Michigan Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Fitting budgetary procedures to local needs. *H. G. Appleby.* The Municipality. June, 1948.

———. A new local tax policy in Pennsylvania. *Raymond E. Evleth.* Dickinson Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. Assessing community needs for capital improvements. *Charles L. Crangle.* Tenn. Planner. June, 1948.

———. The economic classification of cities and its fiscal implications. *Carl H. Chatters.* Nat. Tax Jour. June, 1948.

———. New sources of municipal revenue. *Frederick C. Peitzsch.* Pub. Management. July, 1948.

———. Pennsylvania's new local taxes. *H. F. Alderfer.* State Govt. July, 1948.

Law Enforcement. Defects in the administration of justice in Hamilton county (Cincinnati), Ohio. *Charles O. Porter.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Society. June, 1948.

Local Government. A plea for local government. *M. Hookham.* Pol. Quar. July–Oct., 1948.

———. Local government reform. *W. A. Robson.* Pol. Quar. July–Oct., 1948.

National Program. A national program for municipal governments. *Carl H. Chatters.* Am. City. July, 1948. Western City. July, 1948. Minn. Municipalities. July, 1948.

Personnel. Trends in municipal personnel problems. *Frederick C. Peitzsch.* Pub. Management. June, 1948.

Organization. The organized community—bulwark of democracy. *Harold W. Dodds.* Am. City. July, 1948.

———. Organizing communities for coördinated action. *C. A. Harrell.* Am. City. July, 1948.

Torts. Municipal tort liability in New York. *William J. Lloyd.* New York Univ. Law Quar. Rev. Apr., 1948.

Zoning. A survey of zoning ordinances and plan commissions in Wisconsin cities and villages. *Ernest A. Mosher.* The Municipality. July, 1948.

POLITICAL AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY

Books and Pamphlets

Adams, George P. Man and metaphysics. Pp. 168. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1948.

Aquinas, St. Thomas. Introduction to St. Thomas Aquinas. Anton C. Pegis, ed. Pp. 720. N. Y.: Modern Library. 1948.

Augustine, St. The city of God. tr. and ed. by Marcus Dods. 2 vols. pp. 573, 580. N. Y.: Hafner Pub. Co. 1948.

Barker, Ernest. National character and the factors in its formation Rev. ed. Pp. 268. London: Methuen. 1948.

Berlin, Isaiah. Karl Marx; his life and environment. Pp. 280. London: Oxford. 1948.

Biržiška, Vaclovas. Abraham Kulvietis: the first Lithuanian humanist. Pp. 30. Pinneberg: Baltic Univ. 1947.

Bosworth, Edward I. The Christian religion and human progress. ed. by Ernest Pye. Pp. 339. Oberlin, O. Otis C. McKee. 1948.

Cowell, F. R. Cicero and the Roman republic. Pp. 306. London: Pitman. 1948.

Harper, Ralph. Existentialism: a theory of man. Pp. 175. Cambridge [Mass.]: Harvard Univ. Press. 1948.

Hyde, D. From communism towards catholicism. Pp. 24. London: Paternoster. 1948.

Inge, William R. The end of an age and other essays. Pp. 288. London: Putnam. 1948.

Jensen, Merrill. The Articles of Confederation; an interpretation of the social constitutional history of the American revolution, 1774–1781. 2d. ed. Pp. 299. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press. 1948.

Labaree, Leonard W. Conservatism in early American history. Pp. 322. N. Y.: New York Univ. Press. 1948.

Laski, Harold J. Communist manifesto: socialist landmark. Pp. 171. London: Allen and Unwin. 1948.

Lasswell, Harold D. Power and personality. Pp. 262. N. Y.: Norton. 1948.

Lasswell, Harold D. The analysis of political behavior; an empirical approach. Pp. 314. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner. 1948.

Lauterbach, Albert T. Economic security and individual freedom: can we have both? Pp. 182. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press. 1948.

MacArthur, Kathleen W. The Bible and human rights. Pp. 74. N. Y.: Woman's Press. 1948.

Maclaren, D. Private property and the natural law. Pp. 24. London: Blackfriars Pubs. 1948.

Mahmassani, Sobhi. General theory of the law of obligation and contracts under Muhamman jurisprudence. 2 vols. (Arabic text) London: Luzac. 1948.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Humanisme et terreur; essai sur le problème communiste. Pp. 206. Paris: Gillimand. 1947.

Mosier, Richard D. Making the American mind. Pp. 207. N. Y.: King's Crown Press. 1948.

Moulin, Léo. Socialism of the west; an attempt to lay the foundations of a new socialist humanism. Pp. 336. London: Gollancz. 1948.

Salter, James A. Personality in politics; studies in contemporary statesmen. Pp. 253. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Stanka, V. The great age of world history. Pp. 26. Hamburg: Baltic Univ. 1946.

Sydnor, Charles S. The development of southern sectionalism, 1819–1848. Pp. 412. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press. 1948.

Viteno, Z. Thoughts about the coming man. Pp. 32. Pinneberg: Baltic Univ. 1947.

Wheeler, Leonard R. Harmony of nature; a study in coöperation for existence. Pp. 208. N. Y.: Longmans. 1948.

Articles

Chinese Political Thought. Political thought in China, 1900–1947. *Shao Chang Lee.* China. May, 1948.

Collective Responsibility. Collective responsibility. *H. D. Lewis.* Philosophy. Jan., 1948.

———. Collective guilt. *Ferdinand A. Hermens.* Notre Dame Lawyer. May, 1948.

Communist Manifesto. The centenary of the communist manifesto. *F. Neilson.* Am. Jour. of Econ. and Sociol. July, 1948.

Conservatism. Conservatism—V. *T. E. Utley.* Nat. Rev. July, 1948.

———. The world of John Adams. *Rudolph von Abele.* Am. Mercury. July, 1948.

———. Der konservative staatsgedanke. *Karl Wick.* Politeia. Vol. I Fasc. 1. 1948/49.

Defensor Pacis. John of Jandun and the defensor pacis. *Alan Gewirth.* Speculum. Apr., 1948.

Democracy. Democracy and communism. *Hari Singh Gour.* Mod. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Freedom and planning in a democracy. *Bryn J. Hovde.* Am. Scholar. Summer, 1948.

———. Human equality: the essence of democracy. *Maximilian Beck.* Common Cause. July, 1948.

———. Voluntary arbitration in a democratic society. *P. H. Casselman.* Arbitration Jour. Spring, 1948.

De Tocqueville. Alexis de Tocqueville and America. *Henry Wasser.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

Ethics. Relativism and ethics. *Herbert Dingle.* Nine. Cent. and After. May, 1948.

Federalism. Notes sur le concept "federalisme." *Hans Nawiasky.* Foederalismus und subsidiaritätsprinzip. *Karl Thieme.* Politeia. Vol. I Fasc. 1. 1948/49.

Freedom. Laissez faire and free enterprise. *G. R. Davies.* Am. Jour. of Econ. and Sociol. July, 1948.

———. Effects of international tension on liberty under law. *Fritz Morstein Marx.* Colorado Law Rev. May, 1948.

———. Free society; its basic nature and problem. *Frank H. Knight.* Philosophical Rev. Jan., 1948.

———. The value of freedom. II. *Karl W. Deutsch.* Am. Scholar. Summer, 1948.

Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi's place in history. *Nandalal Chatterji.* Mod. Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Gandhism—a problem stated. *Promatha Nath Ganguly.* Mod. Rev. May, 1948.

———. Mahatma Gandhi. *D. N. Pathak.* Chicago Jewish Forum. Summer, 1948.

Gentile. Gentile and Jew. *Jean-Paul Sartre.* Commentary. June, 1948.

History. A critique of philosophies of history. *Maurice Mandebaum.* Jour. of Philosophy. July 1, 1948.

Human Nature. Human nature and government policy. *Alexander H. Leighton.* Philosophical Rev. Jan., 1948.

Ideology. Beyond ideology. *George H. Sabine.* Philosophical Rev. Jan., 1948.

Individual. The individual and society. *B. J. Hovde.* Am. Jour. of Econ. and Sociol. July, 1948.

Jurisprudence. Morris Cohen's approach to legal philosophy. *Harold J. Laski.* Univ. of Chicago Law Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. The inherent conservatism of the legal profession. *Edgar Bodenheimer.* Indiana Law Rev. Apr., 1948.

———. Roscoe Pound and interpretations of modern legal philosophies. *Sidney Post Simpson.* New York Univ. Law Quar. Rev. July, 1948.

———. El derecho como superador de antagonismos. *Justus Wilhelm Hedemann.* Moneda y Crèdito. Dec., 1947.

———. El recurso de la inconstitucionalidad. *Marco Tulio Zeledón.* Rev. del Colegio de Abogados. Jan., 1948.

———. Mas sobre el recurso de inconstitucionalidad. *Alfredo Saborio.* Rev. del Colegio de Abogados. Feb., 1948.

———. The humane study of law. *Daniel J. Boorstin.* Yale Law Jour. Apr., 1948.

———. An introduction to legal reasoning. *Edward H. Levi.* Univ. of Chicago Law Rev. Spring, 1948.

———. L'humanisme juridique et l'acte de volonté. *Roger Latournerie.* Rev. du Droit Pub. et de la Sci. Pol. Avril-Juin, 1948.

———. Say it with music. *Jerome Frank.* Harvard Law Rev. June, 1948.

———. The natural law and pragmatism. *Ben W. Palmer.* Notre Dame Lawyer, Mar., 1948.

———. Some early stages in European law. *P. B. R. Forbes.* Juridical Rev., Apr., 1948.

———. Roman law as an element in European culture. *J. Kerr Wylie.* South African Law Jour. May, 1948.

———. Max Radin. *William O. Douglas.* California Law Rev. June, 1948.

Lévy-Bruhl. Lévy-Bruhl's concept of "l'Art Moral Rationnel." *Joseph Neyer.* Soc. Research. June, 1948.

Liberalism. The plight of liberalism. *Philip L. Ralph.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

———. What liberalism means to me. *John T. Flynn.* Am. Mercury. Aug., 1948.

———. The dilemma, so-called, of the American liberal. *Louis Filler.* Antioch Rev. Summer, 1948.

———. Liberalism, socialism, and communism. II. *W. L. Burn.* Nine. Cent. and After. May, 1948.

Madison. James Madison: Virginia revolutionist and ardent nationalist. *Walter P. Armstrong.* Am. Bar Assn. Jour. May, 1948.

Marx. The social philosophy of Karl Marx. *Abram L. Harris.* Ethics. Apr., 1948.

———. Karl Marx. *Daniel Villey.* Rev. Brasileira de Econ. Dec., 1947.

———. De Maistre and Marx in the modern world. *Cortez Ewing.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. June, 1948.

Materialism. The retreat from materialism. *Sarah Wingate Taylor.* Catholic World. July, 1948.

Muhammad. Pirenne and Muhammad. *Daniel C. Dennett.* Speculum. Apr., 1948.

Obligation. Obligation and moral agency. *Lucius Garvin.* Ethics. Apr., 1948.

Planning. Le problème de la planification dans une économie collectiviste, II. *M. Allais.* Kyklos. Fasc. 1, 1948.

Political Order. Problèmes de l'ordre politique. *Leon Van Vassenhove.* Politeia. Vol. I, Fasc. 1. 1948/49.

Populism. Leonard Brown, poet and populist. *Luella M. Wright.* Ia. Jour. of Hist. and Pol. July, 1948.

Private Property. The right to private property; an ethical demand on economics. *Arthur Utz.* La subordination de la liberté économique à l'ordre de la personne. *Alain Barrère.* I criteri decisivi della controversia fra sistema di concorrenza ed economia pianificata. *Francesco Vito.* The right of labor to participate actively in the life of enterprise. Politeia. Vol. I, Fasc. 1. 1948/49.

Progress. What is progress? *Willson H. Coates.* Jour. of Philosophy. Jan. 29, 1948.

Realism. Realism—or is it? *Patricia Regan.* Catholic World. June, 1948.

Rights of Man. The philosophic bases and material circumstances of the rights of man. *Richard McKeon.* Ethics. Apr. 1948.

Socialism. The evolution of the socialist vocabulary. *Arthur T. Bestor, Jr.* Jour. of Hist. of Ideas. June, 1948.

MISCELLANEOUS

Books and Pamphlets

Chesterton, A. K., and Leftwich, J. The tragedy of anti-semitism. Pp. 296. London: R. Anscombe. 1948.

Davies, David R. Reinhold Niebuhr: a prophet from America. Pp. 117. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Frank, Lawrence Kelso. Society as the patient. Pp. 395. New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press. 1948.

Josephson, Emanuel M. The strange death of Franklin D. Roosevelt; history of the Roosevelt-Delano dynasty, America's royal family. Pp. 333. N. Y.: Chedney Press. 1948.

Nesbitt, Henrietta. White House diary. Pp. 314. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday. 1948.

Prest, A. R. War economics of primary producing countries. Pp. 308. London: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1948.

Roheim, Geza. Psychoanalysis and the social sciences. Pp. 427. London: Imago. 1948.

Schaffner, Bertram. Fatherland; a study of authoritarianism in the German family. Pp. 215. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1948.

Schneider, Louis. The Freudian psychology and Veblen's social theory. N. Y.: King's Crown Press. 1948.

Sward, Keith. The legend of Henry Ford. Pp. 558. N. Y.: Rinehart. 1948.

Wecter, Dixon. The age of the great depression. 1929–1941. Pp. 374. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1948.

Yeomans, Henry A. Abbott Lawrence Lowell, 1856–1943. Pp. 577. Cambridge, [Mass.]: Harvard Univ. Press. 1948.

Articles

Crime. Capital punishment. *G. Bernard Shaw.* Atlantic. June, 1948.

———. Crime news encourages delinquency and crime. *Paul S. Deland.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Society. June, 1948.

Existentialism. Existentialism. *F. C. Copleston.* Philosophy. Jan., 1948.

Inflation. Inflation: *A Symposium.* Current Hist. July, 1948.

———. Are our wars good times? *William F. Ogburn* and *Jean L. Adams.* Scien. Monthly. July, 1948.

Method. Limits of method. *Peter A. Carmichael.* Jour. of Philosophy. Mar. 11, 1948.

Natural Resources. Conflicting doctrines about soils. *Charles E. Kellogg.* Scien. Monthly. June, 1948.

———. World survey of uranium. *J. Niven.* World Affairs. Apr., 1948.

———. The iron we need. *Clarence B. Randall.* Atlantic. June, 1948.

Newspapers. Great newspapers, if any. *Gerald W. Johnson.* Harper's. June, 1948.

———. PM post-mortem. *Robert Lasch.* Atlantic. July, 1948.

Political Areas. Logistic growth of political areas. *Hornell Hart.* Soc. Forces. May, 1948.

Political Science. Education et science politique. *William F. Russell.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Juin, 1948.

———. Political science 1 and political indoctrination. *Clinton L. Rossiter.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. June, 1948.

———. The rôle of political science in the general social science program. *Arthur D. Angel.* Soc. Sci. July, 1948.

Population. Population problems. *J. Chartres Molony.* Contemp. Rev. May, 1948.

———. Malthus and the principle of population. *Rupert B. Vance.* For. Affairs. July, 1948.

Racism. Racial discrimination in medicine. *Alfred L. Shapiro.* Jewish Soc. Studies. Apr., 1948.

———. Poor whites and unfortunate blacks. *N. H. White.* Contemp. Rev. May, 1948.

———. The negro-white issue in California. *Cy W. Record.* Labor and Nation. May–June, 1948.

———. Collective behavior in race relations. *Clarence E. Glick.* Am. Sociol. Rev. June, 1948.

———. American Jews on the land. *Alfred Werner.* So. Atlan. Quar. July, 1948.

———. Racism: challenge to democracy. *Spencer Logan.* Freedom and Union. July–Aug., 1948.

Social Problems. The study of social problems. *Francis E. Merrill et al.* Am. Sociol. Rev. June, 1948.

Social Sciences. General education in the social sciences. *Edwin R. Walker.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. June, 1948.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

MILES O. PRICE
Law Library, Columbia University

AMERICAN

UNITED STATES

Commerce Department

Census bureau. City employment in 1947. (Government employment for June, 1948). Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 38 p. (processed).

———Historical review of state and local government finances. (State and local government special studies, number 25.) Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 41 p. (processed).

———Revised summary of state and local government finances in 1942. (State

and local government special studies, Number 26.) Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 32 p. (processed).

Congress

House of representatives. Education and labor committee. Right to work. Hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 111. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 72 p.

———*Interstate and foreign commerce committee.* Amending federal trade commission act. Hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 3871. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 298 p.

———*Judiciary committee.* Equal rights amendment to the Constitution and commission on the legal status of women. . . . Hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 218 p.

———Practice before government agencies, hearings . . . 80th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., on H. R. 2657. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 485 p. $1.00.

———*Merchant marine and fisheries committee.* Alaskan problems, hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess. . . . part 4. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 517–527 p.

———*Post office and civil service committee.* Civil service examinations in Panama Canal Zone. Hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 6292. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 34. p.

———Reorganization of the post office department, hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess., Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 60 p.

———*Ways and means committee.* Foreign trade zones, hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 6159 and H. R. 6160. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 69 p.

Joint committee on reduction of non-essential federal expenditures. Assets of wholly owned federal government corporations, fiscal year 1947, additional report pursuant to sec. 601 of revenue act of 1941. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 28 p. (Senate committee print, 80th Cong., 1st sess.).

Senate. Appropriations committee. Economic coöperation administration, hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 684 p.

———*Expenditures in executive departments committee.* Legislative reorganization act of 1946, hearings, 80th Cong., 2d Sess., on evaluation of legislative reorganization act of 1946. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 270 p. 45¢.

———*Foreign relations committee.* Res affirming the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and indicating certain objectives to be pursued. Report, to accompany S. R. 239. 80th Cong., 2d Sess., Report no. 1361. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 9 p.

———*Judiciary committee.* Title to submerged lands beneath tidal and navigable waters, hearings . . . 80th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 1988 and similar House bills. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 335 p.

———*Public lands committee.* Statehood for Hawaii, hearings, 80th Cong., 2d sess. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 497 p. $1.25.

Library of Congress

National bibliography and bibliographical control: a symposium. (Reprinted from *College and Research Libraries*, April, 1948.) Washington, 1948. (processed).

State censuses: an annotated bibliography of censuses of population taken after the year 1790 by states and territories of the United States. Henry J. Dubester. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 73 p. (processed).

Legislative reference service. State rent control laws, analysis of statutory pro-

visions; by Carrie E. Hunter. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 7, 77, 2 p. (processed).

State Department

Building the peace: the Near East—uneasy crossroads. (Foreign affairs outlines no. 16.) Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1948. 4 p.

The following in the numbered series of State Department publications have appeared, all from the Government Printing Office, and 1948, except the first one, which is 1947.

2851. United States treaty developments. (This is a supplement to treaty developments, 1944, and is quite the most ambitious publication of its kind ever attempted by the State Department. It is in loose leaf, about seven hundred to begin with, and covers about everything which can happen to a treaty, from the moment of its submission for approval to the Congress on, including (which is new) annotations to court decisions. It is expected that gradually it will take in all the treaties covered by the 1944 publication, and thus "this publication should serve as a comprehensive guide to official material respecting all treaties and other international agreements to which the United States has become a party in nearly two centuries of treaty-making." Arrangement is by signing date of the primary agreement in case of treaties and of the last note in the case of executive agreements. Appendices list all treaties and agreements in force and those now pending before the Senate. There is a comprehensive subject-index.)

3031. Participation of the United States government in international conferences. 373 p. 65¢.

3059. Germany: economic fusion of American and British zones of occupation. 11 p. 5¢.

3062. Second session of the General Conference of the UNESCO, Mexico City, November 6–December 3, 1947. 185 p. 35¢.

3138. The foreign service of the United States; general information and pertinent laws and regulations, June 1, 1948. 66 p. 20¢.

3148. Second report to Congress on the United States foreign aid program. For the period ended March 31, 1948. 138 p. 35¢.

3149. Third report to Congress on assistance to Greece and Turkey for the period ended March 31, 1948. 63 p. 20¢.

3161. International control of atomic energy. Policy at the crossroads. An informal summary record of the policy developments concerning the international control of atomic energy, October 15, 1946, to May 17, 1948. 251 p. 45¢.

3179. Third report of the United Atomic energy commission to the Security Council, May 17, 1948. 78 p. 25¢.

3195. American peace policy: address by the President, June 12, 1948. 12 p. free.

3204. The Interim Committee of the General Assembly: "The Little Assembly." A legislative history. 22 p. (Reprinted from documents and state papers of June, 1948.)

STATE AND TERRITORIAL

ALABAMA

Legislative reference service. Alabama's lawmaking organization and procedures; a report to the legislative council of Alabama concerning a study of certain aspects of Alabama's legislative process. Montgomery, 1948. 41 p.

———The privilege of voting in Alabama; a compilation of constitutional provisions and statutes governing the procedure of, and qualifications for, registering to vote. Montgomery, 1948. 23 p.

CALIFORNIA

Legislature. Senate. Fact-finding committee on un-American activities. 4th report. Communist front organizations. Sacramento, 1948. 448 p.

University of California, Berkeley. The administration of justice to minority groups in Los Angeles county, by Edwin M. Lemert and Judy Rosbery. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1948. 27 p. 50¢.

CONNECTICUT

Inter-racial commission. Inter-group relations bibliography; a selected list of books, periodicals, and resource agencies in intergroup relations, including a special section devoted to Connecticut studies. Comp. by Henry G. Stetler. Hartford, 1948. 82 p.

GUAM

Guam. (Governors' proclamations and acts of the Guam Congress are again being issued.)

LOUISIANA

Louisiana state law institute, University Station. Constitutional problems. (The Research staff, Constitutional revision project, in 1947 prepared about sixty pamphlets, comprising from two to thirty-five pages, on various aspects of Louisiana constitution and government.)

MASSACHUSETTS

General court. Legislative procedure in the general court of Massachusetts, by John W. Plaisted. Boston, Wright & Potter, 1948. 75 p.

MICHIGAN

Detroit. Civil service commission. Organization charts, City of Detroit. Detroit 26, City Hall, 1948. 74 p. $1.25 (processed).

Legislature. Senate. Committee to study the motor vehicle laws. A comparative study of Michigan motor vehicle law with uniform vehicle code. Lansing, 1948. 57 p.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Bureau of government. Procedures for annexation in Michigan, by Robert Fryer. Ann Arbor, 1948. 4 p. (Michigan governmental digest no. 2.)

MISSISSIPPI

University of Mississippi, University. Bureau of public administration. A guidebook of the board of supervisors, by Huey Blair Howerton. University, 1948. 58 p. (County government series no. 1.)

———Highlights of state finance. R. B. Highsaw and E. M. Johnson, Jr. University, 1948. 51 p.

MISSOURI

General assembly. Committee on legislative research. The establishment of a system of continuous statutory revision. Jefferson City, 1947. 21 p. (Report no. 7.)

University of Missouri, Columbia. Missouri and the World War, 1914–1917; a study in public opinion, by John Clark Crighton. Columbia, 1947. 199 p. (University of Missouri studies, v. 21, no. 3.)

NEW MEXICO

University. Department of government. Division of research. Some factors in the Indian problem in New Mexico. Florence Hawley. Albuquerque, 1948. 48 p. 50¢.

NEW YORK

Constitution. The constitution of the state of New York, as revised., with amendments adopted by the constitutional convention of 1938 and approved by vote of the people Nov. 8, 1938. As amended and in force Jan. 1, 1948. Issued by Thomas J. Curran, secretary of state. Albany, 1948. 353 p.

Legislature. Joint committee on interstate coöperation. Report, 1947. Albany, Williams Press, 1947. 277 p. (Legislative document [1947] no. 73.)

Legislature, Joint committee to revise and recodify the election law. Report. Albany Williams Press, 1947. 39 p. (Legislative document [1947] no. 56.)

Taxation and finance department. Research and statistics bureau. The New York state and local tax system. Albany, 1947. 38 p.

New York City. Board of higher education. [Report of] Committee on personnel status [of the city colleges] to study the whole problem of appointment, evaluation, promotion, tenure, and salary of the teaching, clerical, and administrative staff. New York, 695 Park Avenue, 1948. 47 p. (mim.)

OHIO

Ohio State university, Columbus. Bureau of business research. Population changes, Cincinnati, Ohio, and adjacent areas, 1900–1940, by James A. Quinn, Earle Eubank, and Lois E. Elliott. Columbus, 1947. 32 p. (Research monograph no. 47.)

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania state college, State College. Institute of local government. Registration in Pennsylvania elections, 1926–46, by H. F. Alderfer and Fannette H. Luhrs. State College, 1948. 68 p. $1.00.

SOUTH CAROLINA

University of South Carolina, Columbia. Bureau of public administration. South Carolina state constitution amendment procedures, by Christian L. Larsen and Conrad Cowan. Columbia, 1948. 58 p. (Publication no. 4. Includes constitutional provisions for amending in each of the forty-eight states.)

UTAH

University of Utah, Salt Lake City. Institute of government. The primary convention system in Utah. (A review of Utah's 1947 election law), by René N. Ballard. Salt Lake City, 1947. 16 p. (Institute publication no. 2.)

———The western political quarterly, vol. 1, no. 1, March, 1948. $4.00 a year, $1.50 a number.

VIRGINIA

University of Virginia. Bureau of public administration. A critical appraisal of university bureaus of public administration. A. W. Spicer and others. Charlottesville, 1948. 55 p. $1.00.

WISCONSIN

Department of public welfare. Division of public assistance. Development of public assistance programs in Wisconsin and their administration, 1848–1948. Madison 2, 315 S. Carroll Street, 1948. 51, 30 p. (processed).

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL

CHILE

Universidad nacional de Chile. Facultades de ciencias jurídicas y sociales. El derecho aereo internacional, Sergio Aldunate V. (Thesis). Santiago. 1948, 34 p.

———Sístemas de govierno semi-representativos. El referendum. Valparaiso, 1947. 115 p. (Thesis).

———El comisariato general de subssitencias y precios de la República. Tomo 1. Guillermo Torres O. (Thesis).

———La elección de Presidente de la República. Eduardo Torres de la F. Santiago, 1948. 73 p.

CANADA

Secretary of state for foreign affairs. Report . . . for the year ended December, 1947. Ottawa, King's Printer, 1948. 97 p.

GERMANY

Territory under United States occupation. Office of military government. Civil administration division. Constitutions of the German *laender.* Washington, Civil Affairs Division of U. S. War Department, 1947. 243 p. (Text in English and German.)

GREAT BRITAIN

Colonial office and Foreign office. Palestine: Termination of the mandate. London: H.M.S.O., 1948. 11 p. 3s.

British information services, New York. Not just peanuts; the story of Britain's great agricultural experiment in East Africa. New York, 30 Rockefeller Center, 1948. 28 p. plates.

Government town planner, Palestine. Jerusalem: the city plan: preservation and development during the British mandate, 1918–1948. Henry Kendall. London: H.M.S.O., 1948. 190 p. plates.

Stationery office. Consolidated list of government publications, Jan 1-Dec. 3, 1947. London: H.M.S.O., 1948. 266 p. 1s.

MEXICO

Universidad nacional autonom de México. Facultad de derecho y ciencias sociales. Avila, Fidel Martínez: Transformación política y social del estado. México, 1947. 161 p. (Thesis.)

———Estrada, Julio. Belice. México, 1947. 103 p. (Thesis.)

———Jimenez, Javier. Hacia una nueva política agraria. México, 1948. 91 p. bibl. (Thesis.)

PHILIPPINES

Bureau of census and statistics. Facts and figures about economic and social conditions of the Philippines, 1946–47. Manila, 1948. 107 p.

UNITED NATIONS

Practicing law in the United Nations. (Address by Philip C. Jessup, deputy chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations. A valuable statement of the legal set-up of the U.N.) Lake Success, 1948. 9 p. (Press release no. 489, July 6, 1948.)

Atomic energy commission. An international bibliography on atomic energy, political, economic, and social aspects. Volume 1 (preliminary edition). Lake Success, 1948. 89 p. (mim.) (A final edition is planned for September, 1948.)
Economic and social council. Commission on human rights. Adaptation of municipal law to international conventions. Lake Success, 1948. 5 p. (mim.)
———American declaration of the rights and duties of man, adopted by the ninth international conference of American states. (Extract from the final act of the Conference.) Lake Success, 1948. 9 p. (mim.)
Economic commission for Asia and the Far East. Report and recommendations regarding trade promotion. Lake Success, 1948. 103 p. (mim.)
———Report and recommendations on training of technical personnel in the economic field and the use of expert assistance by governors. Lake Success, 1948. 89 p. (mim.)
———Report on the progress and prospect of repatriation, resettlement, and immigration of refugees and displaced persons. Lake Success, 1948. 67 p. (mim.)
General assembly. Codification of staff rules. Report of the secretary-general. Lake Success, 1948. 43 p. (mim.)
———Interim committee. . . . Measures and procedures of pacific settlement employed by the league of nations. Lake Success, 1948. 42 p. (mim.)
———Study on methods for the promotion of international coöperation in the political field. Lake Success, 1948. 35 p. (mim.)
———Preparation of political and security matters placed before previous sessions of the General Assembly. Lake Success, 1948. 8 p. (mim.)
———Problem of voting in the Security Council. . . . Lake Success, 1948. 42 p. (mim.)
International civil aviation organization. Second assembly, Geneva, June, 1948. Legal commission. [Reports]. Lake Success (?) 1948. 5 p. (mim.)
———Revision of the Warsaw convention: Documents on the revision of the Warsaw convention. Lake Success (?), 1948. 65 p. (mim.)
———. . . Draft convention on the international recognition of rights in aircraft. Lake Success (?), 1948. 7 p. (mim.)
Public information department, Press and publications bureau. Report on repatriation, resettlement, and immigration of refugees and displaced persons. Press release no. 597. Lake Success, 1948. 7 p. (mim.)
———Draft convention on genocide approved. Lake Success, 1948. 13 p. (mim.)
Security council. Report of the United Nations mediator on Palestine to the Security Council. Lake Success, 1948. 19 p. (mim.)
Trusteeship council. Reply of the government of the Union of South Africa to the Trusteeship Council questionnaire on the report to the United Nations of the administration of South West Africa for the year 1946. Lake Success, 1948. 230 p. (mim.)

NOTES ON SOME RECENT DOCUMENTARY MATERIALS

JAMES B. CHILDS
Library of Congress

At New Delhi, India, the Constituent Assembly of India met for the first time on December 9, 1946, with representatives elected by the provincial legislative bodies in accordance with paragraph 21 of the Statement by the Cabinet Delegation

and the Viceroy dated May 16, 1946. The stenographic record in English of the proceedings of this and of the subsequent sessions was published in Hansard style in blue covered pamphlets by the Manager of Publications, Delhi, as *Constituent Assembly Debates.*

The *Papers relating to the Cabinet Mission to India, 1946,* recording the effort to help the Indians decide on the future constitution of India, whether united or divided, were published in London by H. M. Stationery Office as Cmd. 6821, 6829, 6839, 6861, and 6862, and reprinted at Delhi in a single pamphlet of 65 pages. Anil Chandra Banerjee, in his two volumes entitled *Indian constitutional documents* (Calcutta, A. Mukherjee & Co., 1945–46), covers pertinent retrospective material, 1757–1945.

To facilitate the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly, Sir B. N. Rau as constitutional adviser prepared three series of *Constitutional precedents* in 1946–47. In the first series (2d ed., 1947, 119 pp.) are treated the problems of linguistic provinces and regional arrangements, union subjects, safeguards for minorities, protection of tribal rights and interests, and protection of rights of women and children. In the second series (2d ed., 1947, 297 pp.) are collected certain of the more important constitutions of the world, those of Canada, Australia, South Africa, Ireland, and the Leeward Islands from the British Commonwealth, and those of the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Switzerland, Free City of Danzig, Germany (Second Reich), China, and Japan. In the third series (1947, 172 pp.) were presented studies on the head of the state, fundamental rights, second chambers, and systems of representation.

The Constituent Assembly itself met from the 9th to the 21st of December, 1946, from the 20th to the 25th of January, 1947, again from the 28th of April to the 2nd of May, and still further in July from the 15th through the 31st. The session on the afternoon of the 21st of December was held *in camera* on the report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, the *Constituent Assembly debates* for this session (vol. 1, no. 11, p. 163–246) not being made availabe to the public. The *Rules of procedure and standing orders, second edition, as amended up to 31st July, 1947,* was printed as a pamphlet of 17 pages, to which there are separate supplements dated August 14 and 19. A directory of committees was issued in 1947 as a pamphlet of 23 pages entitled *Personnel of committees, with the resolutions or rules under which they were set up. Reports of committees* (first series) *1947 (from December, 1946, to July, 1947)* constitute a separate publication of 76 pages, including those on the States representation (there had been none until July), and on the Union constitution and powers. Two numbers of a *Statistical handbook* in foolscap folio size were printed, the first (23 pp.) giving the population according to communities, and the second (43 pp.) giving the population according to languages, both based on the 1931 census.

For the period from the 7th of July, 1946, to the 6th of January, 1947, a pamphlet of 36 pages was printed for the constituent Assembly under the title *Documents relating to the statement made by the British Cabinet Mission and H. E. the Viceroy on the 16th May, 1946,* and for the period from the 7th of January to the 30th of June, 1947, another of 40 pages entitled *Documents relating to the statements made by H. M. Government on 6th December, 1946, 20th February, 1947, and 3rd June, 1947,* recording the final decision on the establishment of two dominions. The Indian Independence Act, 1947, being 10 & 11 Geo. 6, ch. 30, assented to July 18, 1947, providing for the establishment on August 15, 1947, of the two dominions (India and Pakistan), was also published at Delhi as a separate pamphlet of 15 pages under the title *Indian Independence Act.* Although the Indian (provisional constitution) order was made on August 14, 1947, it was not until November that the *Government of India Act, 1935 [as adapted by the India (provisional constitution) order, 1947],* was published as a volume of 164 pages.

Under clause 8 of the Indian Independence Act, the Constituent Assembly exercises after August 15, 1947, not only the power as to the making of a constitution but also the power of the Indian Legislature as to legislation until other provision is made. Previously, the Indian Legislature had consisted of a Council of State and a Legislative Assembly, constituted in 1921 under the imperial Government of India Act, 1919. The proceedings of the Council of State, which adjourned finally on April 16th, 1947, were reported in daily parts as *Council of State debates*, later published in consolidated volumes. The proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, which adjourned finally on April 12, 1947, were reported in daily parts as *Legislative Assembly debates*, later published in consolidated volumes. The advisory organization, Chamber of Princess, inaugurated in 1921 in exercise of the British paramountcy and discontinued on the division onto the two dominions had published the stenographic reports of its formal sessions as *Proceedings of the Meetings of the Chamber of Princess* (*Narendra Mandel*), beginning with those of 1929, the earlier reports being considered confidential.

The Constitution of the Union of Burma, after being voted unanimously by the Constituent Assembly at Rangoon on September 24, 1947, was printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing and Stationery at Rangoon in an English edition of 67 pages and in a combined Burmese and English edition of 78 and 78 pages, the Burmese and English text facing each other on opposite pages. The bilingual edition has been reprinted several times and not less than 20,000 copies circulated. Also the text of the Constitution seems to have been published widely in the newspapers.

Article 216 may be noted with interest as follows: "The official language of Burma shall be Burmese, provided that the use of the English language may be permitted." Provision for the protection of minorities as well as for the establishment of the Shan, Kachin, and Karenni states and further of the special regions of the Karens and the Chins is included in the constitution.

Forecasting article 216 of the constitution, the *Constituent Assembly debates* have been printed in Hansard style in only a Burmese language edition in daily parts with only an occasional bit of English, thus posing a problem for the student unfamiliar with the language but interested in the content.

The Constituent Assembly, consisting of 210 members elected in April, 1947, and 45 nominated to represent the frontier areas, held its first session in June to discuss the draft of a new constitution for Burma as an independent sovereign republic prepared by the convention of the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League late in May. After adopting rules of procedure and electing subcommittees to work on the draft, the Assembly adjourned. From July 29 to August 17, it held its second session, leaving the draft constitution in the hands of the drafting committee. In the interim the Assembly had the advice for about three weeks of Sir B. N. Rau, constitutional adviser to the Government of India. U. Chan Htoon was the constitutional adviser to the Government of Burma. The final session of the Assembly met on September 15, and unanimously adopted the constitution of the Union on September 24, and elected Sao Shwe Thaik, Sawbwa of Yawnghwe, on September 25 as provisional president of the union.

On January 4, 1948, the appointed day in the imperial Burma Independence Act, 1947 (11 Geo. 6, ch. 3) assented to on December 10, 1948, Burma became an independent country. In the *Burma Gazette* of January 24, 1948, pt. 1, pages 129–148, is the lengthy Union of Burma (Adaptation of Laws) Order, 1948. It may be noted that the notifications of the President of the Union are printed in Burmese in the *Burma Gazette*. Under Article 231 of the constitution, the Constituent Assembly "shall itself exercise all the powers, discharge all the duties and enjoy all the privi-

leges" of the Union Parlaiment, which is to consist of a Chamber of Deputies and a Chamber of Nationalities within 18 months of the coming into operation of the constitution. The constitution became effective by proclamation of the Provisional President of the Union on January 4, 1948.

In 1937, Burma had ceased to be a province of India with the coming into force of the Government of Burma Act, 1935. The Legislature was composed of an elected House of Representatives and a Senate, half chosen by the House and half nominated. Debates of each body were published separately in daily parts under the title *Proceedings*. In May, 1942, the seat of the government was transferred as a result of the war to Simla, India, and under proclamation of December 10, 1942, the Governor of Burma assumed the powers and functions of the two legislative chambers, his various actions being published at Simla in the *Burma Gazette*. During the period of the occupation, another *Burma Gazette* was printed at Rangoon, mainly in the Burmese language. In May, 1945, at the time Burma was liberated, the Government in London published a White Paper (Cmd. 6635) giving a statement of policy on Burma. In October, 1945, civil administration was restored, and the proclamation of October 17 constituted an appointed Legislative Council of fifty members to advise and aid the Governor in legislative matters. This body met from February 28 to March 26, 1946, and the debates, to a limited extent in Burmese, were published in 17 daily parts (664 pp.) as *Proceedings of the Legislative Council*.

In French Indo-China, formal organization of Cochin China as a republic, with capital at Saigon, was marked by the publication of a weekly *Journal officiel de la republique de Cochinchine*, no. 1, dated July 15, 1946, containing not only acts and declarations of the republic, but those of the High Commissariat and of the home government relating to Cochin China, as well as notices, communications, and announcements of official character. In no. 1 is given the text of a convention of June 3, 1946, between the French Commissioner for Cochin China and the Provisional Government fixing the outline for the organization of the Provisional Government. In December, 1946, the convention was amended to provide for eleven ministries instead of the original nine. The first organization of a Provisional Government had been in March, 1946.

For the kingdom of Cambodia with capital at Phnom Penh, a constitution had been promulgated on May 5, 1947, a French text being available in the *Bulletin d'information* of the Ministère de la France d'Outre-Mer, no. 103 (June 16, 1947), pp. 3–10. Cambodian is the official language except in matters regarding the French Union. There is a weekly *Journal officiel du Cambode*.

For the kingdom of Laos, formed by the union of the provinces administered directly by the French with the kingdom of Luang-Prabang, a *Constitution du royaume du Laos* drafted by a Constituent Assembly during February, March, and April, 1947, and promulgated May 11, 1947, was published in French by the Ministère de l'intérieur of the kingdom as a ten-page pamphlet, as well as in the Laotian language as an eleven-page pamphlet. Laotian is the official language excepting in matters relating to the French Union. The French text of the Constitution is printed in the *Bulletin d'information* of the Ministère de la France d'Outre-Mer, no. 110 (September 22, 1947), pp. 6–10. Laos is declared to be "un État autonome membre de l'Union Française" without mention of a Federation of Indo-China.

In the British zone of occupation in Germany, a German central legal authority under the name Zentral-Justizamt with its seat at Hamburg was created by Military

Government ordinance 41, effective October 1, 1946, responsible for the efficient administration of justice, and having the power subject to the approval of Military Government to initiate, draft and promulgate legislation for the British zone on subjects within the field of the former Reichsjustizministerium. The Zentral-Justizamt published under date of April 23, 1947, the first number of the *Verordnungsblatt für die Britische Zone: Amtliches Organ zur Verkündigung von Rechtsverordnungen der Zentralverwaltungen*, carrying out its legislative functions. Appearing once or twice a week, the *Verordnungsblatt* services for the British zone the same purpose as the former *Reichsgesetzblatt*, the main section of which seems to have ceased publication at Berlin with no. 10 on April 11, 1945. Carrying out its functions in the administration of justice, the Zentral-Justizamt began publication with July, 1947, of a monthly *Zentral-Justizblatt für die Britische Zone: Amtliches Blatt für Rechtspflege*, patterned after the former *Preussisches Justizministerialblatt*, which on the national ministry taking over the state ministry had been merged in *Deutsche Justiz*, continuing from 1935 through February, 1945. The *Zentral-Justizblatt* contains legal articles, digests of the more important court decisions, memoranda explaining the ordinances, reviews, announcements, appointments, as well as (beginning with September, 1947) a separate monthly supplement entitled *Die Spruchgerichte, herausgegeben vom Generalinspekteur für die Spruchgerichte in der Britischen Zone*, with articles relating to denazification matters and decisions in denazification cases. In no. 4 of the *Zentral-Justizblatt* is a careful list of the current official gazettes and legal periodicals in each of the four zones. It may further be noted that a supreme court for the British zone (Oberster Gerichtshof) had been created at Cologne by Military Government ordinance 98, effective January 1, 1948.

For Austria, the text of the constitution of 1920 with amendments, the documents relating to the reëstablishment of independent Austria in 1945, constitutional laws relating to the symbols of the state, rights of citizens, publications of laws, elections, the rules of procedure of the Nationalrat and of the Bundesrat, Constitutional Court decisions, etc., have been reëdited for the fifth time as of March 1, 1947, by Ludwig Adamovich, professor at the University of Vienna and chief justice of the Verfassungsgerichtshof, and published in 1947 under the title *Die Bundesverfassungsgesetze* (xviii, 701 pp.) as Neue Folge, Band 1, of the series *Handausgabe österreichischer Gesetze und Verordnungen*. A special volume in the series has been assigned for the publication of the constitutional laws of the Länder (provinces) and of Vienna.

For the Mexican government, a much-needed directory has been published recently under the title *Directorio del gobierno federal de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos* (LXXI, 536 pp.) by the Direccion técnica de Organización Administrativa of the Secretaría de Bienes Nacionales e Inspección Administrativa. At the beginning is given the text of the constitution of 1917 as amended and the "Ley de secretarías y departamentos de estado" as of January 1, 1947. The arrangement is in the order of the branches of the government (legislative, judicial, and executive), and the secretaries of the executive branch in the order of precedence. Not only are the names of the principal officials given as well as the members of Congress, but a statement of the functions of the agencies with citations to pertinent laws. It is proposed to publish the directory annually. The Secretaría de Bienes Nacionales e Inspección Administrativa, one of the two principal departments established as of January 1, 1947, the other being the Secretaría de Recursos Hidráulicas, has also issued a 117-page report for presentation to the regular session of Congress under the title *Informe reglamentario* covering its activities from January through August, 1947.